

# SCHISM

Detected in both Extreame.

OR TWO SORTS OF

## Sinful Separation.

The FIRST PART detecteth the Schismatical Principles of a Resolver of three Cases about Church-Communion.

The SECOND PART Confuteth the Separation pleaded for, in a Book famed to be written by Mr. Raphson.

---

Rom. 15. 7. Receive ye one another as Christ received us, to the Glory of God.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for Tho. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside, near Mercers Chappel. 1684.

# SCISS M

Printed in South America

BY TWO SCISS M

## SCISS M

THE FIRST PART contains the  
History of a Revolution since  
the Commencement

THE SECOND PART contains the  
History of a Revolution since  
the Commencement

THE THIRD PART contains the  
History of a Revolution since  
the Commencement

THE FOURTH PART contains the  
History of a Revolution since  
the Commencement

P  
R  
I  
J  
M  
P



THE DANGEROUS  
**SCHISMATICK**  
CLEARLY DETECTED,  
and fully CONFUTED;

For the Saving of a Distracted Nation from  
that which would destroy Christian Love  
and Unity.

Occasioned by a Resolver of Three CASES about  
CHURCH-COMMUNION.

By *RICHARD BAXTER* a Catholique Christian, who is  
against confining Christian Love and Communion to any Sect  
how Great soever.

Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*

John 13. 35. *By this shall all men know you are my Disciples, if ye  
have Love one to another.*

1 John 4. 16. *He that dwelleth in Love dwelleth in God, and he in him.*

Rom. 14. 1. 17, 18. *Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye, but not  
to doubtful Disputations: for the Kingdom of God is not Meat and  
Drink, but Righteousness and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost:  
for he that in these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and  
approved of Men.*

LONDON,

Printed for *Thomas Parkhurst* at the Bible and Three Crowns at the  
lower end of Cheapside near Mercers-Chappel, 1683.

THE DANGEROUS  
 SCHISMATICK  
 CLEARLY DETECTED  
 and fully CONFUTED

For the SAVING of a Distressed Nation from  
 that which would destroy Christian Love  
 and Unity.

Occasioned by a Resolution of the  
 CHURCH-COMMISSION.

By the REV. JOHN WILKINSON, A. M. a Learned Christian, who is  
 against continuing Christian Love and Communion to any Schi-  
 sm. Christ forever.

Mark 16. 16. Whosoever will be saved, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.  
 John 13. 35. By this shall all men know that I am the Son of Man, if I shall love them, as I have loved you.  
 1 John 4. 19. If thou shalt love those that love thee, what greater love canst thou have than that I love those that love me, and that I lay down my life for them?  
 Rom. 14. 1. 12. If we therefore shall not be able to bear one another's burdens, yet will we strive to bear the burden of one another, as the Lord shall direct.  
 1 Cor. 13. 1. If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am like a brass that tinkles.  
 approved of them.

LONDON  
 Printed for Thomas Parkhurst at the Bible and Paper-Grocers in the  
 lower end of Church-lane near St. Dunstons Church, 1681.

*The English Schismatick, detected and confuted :  
Occasioned by a Resolver of Cases about Church  
Communion.*

CHAP. I.

SAITH THE RESOLVER,

§. 1. **T**HE Church is a Body or Society of men separated from the rest of the World, and united to God and to themselves by a Divine Covenant.

A. He saith this is the plainest description he can give: That is not the fault of his Auditors or Readers. 1. As to the *Genus*, a Community of equals without Rulers is a body: but I suppose he meaneth not such. 2. Is it enough that it be of *Men*? sure now they should be *Christians*? 3. Many are *separated from the rest of the World*, *secundum quid*, that are no Christians; some in one respect and some in another, and none in all respects. 4. *United to God*, is an ambiguous word, no *Creature* is *United* to him perfectly so as to be thereby what he is, *God*, in the created Nature. Only Christ is united to him Hypostatically in his created Nature. All are so far united to him in natural being, as that in him they live and move and have their being: And the Nature of man is one sort of his Image: All things are united to him as effects to their constant efficient. The Church should not be defined without any mention of Christ: The Churches Union with God is by Christ. 5. Christ himself as Head is an essential part of the Church, and should not be left out of a Definition, tho' the meer Body may in common speech be called *the Church*, as the People may be called a *Kingdom*. 6. Will any *Divine Covenant* serve? or must it not be only the Baptismal Covenant? 7. Is it called *Divine* only as made by God, or as commanded by God and made by Man, or as mutual? Certainly Gods Law and offered or Conditional Promise is most frequently called *His Covenant* in Scripture; and this uniteth not men to God, till they consent and Covenant with him. Their own *Covenant Act* is necessary hereto: And that is a *Divine Covenant*, only as commanded, and accepted and done by Gods assisting Grace. 8. The form of a Church is Relative, and the *Terminus* is essential to a Relation. It is no definition that hath not the End

of the Association: Therefore this is none at all; and so the beginning tells us what to expect.

This description hath nothing in it, but what may agree to divers forms of Society, and so hath not the form of a Church: And if he intended not a Definition, but a loose description, I would a defining Doctor had had the Chair, during this controversy.

Let us try this description upon a *Mahometan* Kingdom, Army, or Navy, or suppose them meer Deists.

1. Such a Kingdom, Army, or Navy may be a Society. 2. Of Men. 3. Separated from the rest of the World *secundum quid & ad hoc* (and none are separated from it *simpliciter & ad omnia*: e. g. No man is separated from the common humanity; No Deist from any but Atheists, and no Christian in believing a God and the Law of Nature and Nations.) 4. They are *United to God* so far as *owning a God* and Worshipping him amounts to, besides the Union of the Creature with the Creator in whom he liveth, &c. And no unregenerate ungodly Christian is united to him savingly. 5. They are united among themselves. 6. This is by a Covenant: 7. And by a Covenant Divine, as to *command, approbation and object*. It is God that they Covenant to own and obey: The common Profession of the *Mahometans*, is, *There is one God, and Mahomet is his Prophet*. It is Divine in *tantum* as commanded. For God Commandeth all men to Own him; to believe that *God is*, and *that he is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him*: And God so far approveth it: *St. James* saith, (*Thou dost well*) to him that believeth there is a God, much more that is professedly devoted to him.

Let us by this examine the Jewish Church: *Jews* now may be 1. A Body, 2. Of Men, 3. Separated from the rest of the World, even in Religion and Church pretensions. 4. United to God as Creatures, as Men, as the corporal seed of *Abraham*, and as professing Belief, Love and Obedience to God, as their God. 5. Strictly united among themselves: 6. By a Covenant, 7. Which God once commanded, and still approveth so far as they own God.

Let us consider whether this description take not in, those in every Nation that fear God and work Righteousness, that never heard of Christ, (being thus combined.) And whether the Kingdom of God, be not larger than his Church: Joyn the Head and Tail of this mans book together, and by the Head (the description) for ought I see, *Jews, Mahometans*, if not almost all Heathens, are the Church: But at the End, I think none on Earth is the Church: At least none that separate from a pair of Organs, or an ignorant Curate; Nor can any man know who.

Page 2. §. 2. He explaineth his Word [*Body*] as opposed to a confused Multitude.

A. But a Community of Equals, that have no Governours, may have order, and be no confused Multitude. And he himself after pleads over much for anecessity of Rulers.



P. 3. §. 3. And in many places, his Confusion and grand error is repeated, that the *Christian Church* is but one: p. 7. *We know no Church but what all Christians are members of by Baptism, which is the Universal Church*: p. 8. *There is but one Church, of which all Christians are members, as there is but one Covenant*; p. 19. *If there be but one Church and one Communion, of which all true Christians are members, &c.* p. 23. *I am no otherwise a member of any particular Church, than I am of the Universal*: p. 40. *It's a schismatical Notion of membership that divides the Christian Church into distinct memberships, and therefore into the distinct Bodies*: And p. 19. and often he saith, *those Churches which are not members of each other, are separate Churches and Schismaticks*.

A. I had hoped that no man but Mr. *Cherry* had talkt at this rate.

I. It's agreed on, that there is but one Universal Church: The contrary is a Contradiction. 2. It is agreed, that there is no lawful particular Church which is not a part of the Universal. 3. That whoever hath just Union and Communion with a true particular Church, hath Union and Communion with the Universal: 4. That all men in their Worship of God, should accordingly perform it (and do all that they do) as Men in that Relation to the Universal Church: None of this is controverted.

II. But I had hoped never to have heard any but *Seekers* say, that there are not many lawful particular Churches, distinct from the whole and from one another, though not disjunct in the Common Essentials. For the proof of the contrary,

1. I begin with that which I expect should be most powerful; The mans own after-Confessions, to which he is oft brought. *Pag. 8. Distance of Place and the necessities and conveniences of Worship and Discipline, has divided the Church into several parts and members, and Particular Churches, &c.* So *pag. 14. pag. 19. All Christian Churches ought to be members of one.* More fully p. 20, 21. This is *ad hominem*, *Tea and Noy* is his Resolution.

2. But I'll bring other Arguments that prevail more with me. The Sacred Scriptures oft tell us of many Churches, therefore there are many. *Act. 9. 31. The Churches had rest*; and *15. 4. Confirming the Churches*; *16. 5. So were the Churches established in the Faith*; *Rom. 16. 4. All the Churches of the Gentiles*: So *ver. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 17. So ordain I in all Churches*; *11. 16. Neither the Churches of God (have such Custom)*; *14. 33. As in all the Churches of the Saints*; *34. Let your Women keep silence in the Churches.* So *16. 1. 19. & 2 Cor. 8. 1. The Grace of God bestowed on the Churches of Macedonia*: *18. Whose Praise is in the Gospel through all the Churches.* So *19. 23, 24. and 11. 8. 28. The care of all the Churches*; *12. 13. Inferior to the other Churches.* *Gal. 1. 2, 22. 1 Thes. 2. 14. 2 Thes. 1. 4. Rev. 1. 4. To the seven Churches*, *ver. 11. 20. Angels and Candlesticks of the seven Churches.* And *2. 7, 11, 17, 29. and 3. 6, 13, 22, 23. and 22. 16. His Concordance might have shew'd him all these in order, Phil. 4. 13. No Church communicated with me (concerning giving and receiving) but ye only.* The dispute now must be, whether



the Apostles or this *Resolver* be to be believed: They say, there are *many Churches*, parts of *One*; he saith, *There is but one*, and it's *Schismatical* to divide it into distinct memberships or *Bodies*, &c. It's no Schisme here to say, I am for *Paul* and the Holy Scripture: Let who will believe the contradictor.

"3. My next Argument is this: Where there are many Political Societies, consisting of Christian Pastors and People, professedly associated for the ordinary Exercise of those Relations as such, in holy Communion, in Christian Doctrine, Worship, Order and Conversation, for Edification in true Faith, Hope, Love and Obedience, and the Glorifying of God therein. There are many distinct true Churches, parts of the Church Universal; *But on Earth there are many such Societies*, &c. *Ergo*, &c.

Either the controversy is *De re* or *de nomine* ( for we called *Separatists* use to separate these. ) 1. If *de re*; Let the existence of the thing defined be tryed by Scripture, Reason and common Experience: 2. If *de nomine*; *Forma qua dat esse dat Nomen*: Here is the true *specifick form* which is found in many single Churches, *ergo* the Name of such *single* ( or individual ) Churches is due to them.

4. Again *ad hominem*, from the consequences: 1. If there be not many single Churches in the Universal, then there are not many Patriarchal, National, Provincial, Metropolitcal, -Diocesan, or Parochial Churches: For *non entium non datur numerus*: Many *nothings* is a contradiction. *Multi sunt ergo sunt*; *Adest tertij adjecti ad est secundi valet argumentum*.

But if there be not many, then 1. All the Parish Churches in *England* being but one, and not many, a Patron can have right to present to no one as a Church, more than to another. 2. Then the Parson, Vicar or Curate is no more the Parson of one Church than of another; nor bound to no more Care and Duty; for there is but one. 3. Then no one is bound to go to one Parish Church more than another; for there is but one. 4. Then the Temple and Tithes belong no more to one than another. 5. Then no Bishop is the proper Bishop of one Diocesan Church, more than of another. 6. Then all the revenues of the Bishop of *London*, are no more appropriate to one Church than to another. 7. Then you owe no more Obedience to the Bishops of one Diocesan Church than another: 8. Then you make the King no more Head or Governour of the Church of *England*, than of another. 9. Then a Diocesan oweth no Reverence to a Metropolitane Church ( if there be none such. ) 10. Then many Churches cannot have Communion nor send Bishops to Councils; ( if there be not many. ) 11. And the charge of Separation from a Church that is no Church, is a contradiction.

5. I adde, from Parity of Reason, if many distinct subordinate Societies may make one Civil Body Politick, so they may one Universal Church: But the Antecedent is undoubted. If it be Learnedly said with Mr. *Cheny*, that *one whole cannot be Part of another whole*; One may attain the perfection by that time he hath worn the Breeches but a few years, to know that a whole

family

mily may be part of a whole Village, and a whole Vicinage be part of a whole City, and a whole Colledge be part of a whole University; and a whole City part of a whole Kingdom; and a whole Kingdom part of the whole Earth.

And if it be objected, that the Names of the *whole* and *parts* are here divers; but a *Church* and a *Church* are the same Name. I Answer, at the same age one may learn that the same Name proveth not the sameness of the things Named; and that *ex penuria nominum* the *Genus* and *Species*, the *Totum* and *Parts* have oft equivocally the same Name, with the Addition of just Notes of distinction. Sometimes an Academy of many Schools is called *Schola*, and so are the single Schools therein: The City of *London* is a *Society*; and so are the Societies of Merchant-Taylors, Drapers, Mercers, &c. therein.

S. 4. But these Churches must be members of one another, or they are Schismatics.

A. 1. How can that be, if they be all but one. 2. This is also above or below the *serula* age. They are no members of one another, but all members of the whole: Yet how oft have we this with the sting of Schisme (as *Damning* as *Murder* or *Adultery*) in the Tail of it. The hand is not a member or part of the Foot, or the Foot of the Hand, or the Liver a member of the Lungs, &c. but each one of the Man: If ever I were a Schoolmaster again, I would perswade my Boyes, that A is not a member of B, nor B of C, &c. but each of the Alphabet; And that one leaf of their Book is not a member of another, but both of the Book; And if they were ripe for the University, I would perswade them that *Exeter* Colledge is not a member of *Corpus Christi*, nor that of *Lincoln*, &c. but all of the Universitie of *Oxford*. And I think that *Bristol* is not a member of *Exeter* or *Gloucester*, &c. but all of *England*; and that the Company of Stationers are not part of the Society of Merchants or Drapers, &c. but all of *London*.

What a Priviledg is it, that a Man may believe this about any such thing without Schisme and Damnation! And how dreadful to fall into such Churchmens hands that in their Case make it Schisme, Separation and Damnation. But there is a Remedy.

S. 5. But he hath reason for what he saith: p. 334. [Indeed it is extremely absurd and unreasonable, to say, that the Christian Church, which is built on the same Foundation, &c. who enjoy all Priviledges in Common, should be divided into as distinct and separate Bodies, tho' of the same kind and nature, as Peter, James and John are distinct Persons --- It's absurd to say, That where every thing is common there is not one Community.]

Ans. Let us not swallow this without Chewing: 1. Whether all be extremely absurd and unreasonable which such Doctors call so; I am grown to doubt as much as whether all be Schism which Schismatics call so: *Ipse dixit* is no Proof.

2. What the meaning of this great, Decantate Word [*Separate*] is; must

must anon be enquired: But, may not Churches be *distinct* and not culpably separate? He confesseth afterwards both local distinction and separation.

3. How far are the *Universal Church* and *Particular Churches* distinct? As *Whole* and *Parts*? Must the World at last learn that *Whole* and *Parts* are not distinct? If you take it for absurd to distinguish a Man from a Body, or from a Liver, Hand or Foot, Dissenters do not; nor to distinguish a Colledge from an University, a House from a Street, a Street from a City, &c.

But how are the *Particular Churches* distinguished one from another? Reader, so constantly do such men fight with themselves, that it's meet to ask, whether they that thus say there are not many distinct Churches, do not assert a far wider difference between many, than those they dissent from. We affirm that there are many, and that they differ not in *specie*, but *numero*, as Colledges, Cities do among themselves; but these men, after all this, hold not only a numerical, but a specifick difference, even as Parochial, Diocesan, Provincial, Patriarchal, National; at least Presbyters and Diocesans differing *Ordine vel Specie* with them, the Church denominated from them must do so too.

§ 6. But he confirms it. [Peter, James and John, tho' they partake of the same common nature, yet each of them have a distinct Essence and Subsistence of their own, and this makes them distinct Persons; but where the very Nature and Essence of a Body or Society consists in having all things common, there can be but one Body.]

*Ans.* I hope its no culpable Separation to distinguish things as differing *specie & numero*; and this is the Doctors meaning, if his words are significant: and the common way of expressing it would have been, [Peter and John differ numerically but not in *specie*; but two Churches differ neither *specie* nor *numero*.]

And 1. Reader, whereas he said before, that the Church is not divided into distinct Bodies, as James and John, &c. ] did you think till now, that James and John, and the Doctor, and the several Bishops had not been distinct parts of the Church in their distinct natural bodies?

2. And why may there not be distinct Politick Bodies, or Compound in one whole as well as natural? certainly, all things corporeal save Atomes are Compounds: A Muscle, a Hand, a Foot, parts similar and dissimilar in man are all compounded of lesser Parts. If many Students may make one Colledge, why may not many Colledges make one University? It's strange if a Doctor deny this.

3. But let us consider of his Reason, and enquire 1. *Whether the Church have all things Common.* 2. *Whether the very Essence of it consist in this.*

1. It is granted that the whole Essence of the Genus and Species is found in every individual of that Species, Natural or Politick; but did we ever hear,  
till

till Mr. *Cheny* and this Doctor said it, that Politick Bodies differ not *numero* as well as Natural? The Kingdom of *England* and of *France* are two; the Church of *Rome* and *Constantinople* long strove which should be uppermost, but who ever said that they were not two?

II. Have they all things common? Dissenters would have excepted Wives and Husbands, (tho the Canons called Apostolical do not;) Why should the Essence of a Church lie in this, and not the Essence of a City or Kingdom? Tories in *Ireland* would have all common; Merchants and Tradesmen, Knights, Lords and Princes here would not. But it's no Schism here also to distinguish *simpliciter* & *secundum quid*, Propriety and the use of Propriety: There is no Community without Propriety: Men have first a Propriety in themselves, their members, their food, the acquests of their Labours, their Wives and Children, and Goods. And they consent to Community to preserve this Propriety, because every man loveth himself: And yet they must use their Propriety, (even of Life) for common good, because all are better than one: But if they had no Propriety they could not so use it for the Common-wealth.

And I never conformed to the Doctrine that denyeth Propriety in Church Members and Particular Churches, and thought all simply common. I'll tell you what Particular Churches have to individuate them, not common to all.

1. They consist of individual natural Persons, many of which as much differ from many other Persons, (those in *England* from those in *Spain*) as one man doth from another.

2. Their Graces and gifts are numerically distinct (Faith, Hope, Love, &c.) from those of other Churches tho *eiusdem speciei*. 3. *England* and *France*, *London* and *Oxford*, have Churches of different place and Situation: 4. But the formal individuating difference is their nearest Relation to their several Pastors; as several Kingdoms, Cities, Schools are numerically distinct by their distinct Kings, Maiors, School-masters, so are several Churches *eiusdem speciei*. 1. *Thess.* 5. 12, 13. Know those that are among you and over you in the Lord, and esteem them highly in love for their Works sake. As every mans Wife, Children and Servants must be used for the common good, and yet are not common, one mans Wife and Children are not anothers; So the Bishop of *London*, of *Oxford* &c. must govern his Church for the good of the Universal; but he is not the Bishop of *Gloucester*, *Norwich*, *Paris*, *Rome*.

These are differences enow to constitute a numerical difference of Churches: *Paul* distinguisheth the Bishops of *Philippi*, *Ephesus*, &c. from others.

Do you yet see no Privileges that one hath Proper, and not common to all? none that make a difference in specie, but both numerical and gradual.

1. All Churches have not Bishop *Jewel*, Bishop *Andrew*, Doctor *Stillingfleet*, Doctor *Sherlock* to be their Teachers: All Churches be not taught all that's in this Resolver. 2. All Churches have not men of the same sound-



ness nor excellency of Parts: It was once taken for lawful to account them specially worthy of double honour who laboured in the Word and Doctrine, and to esteem men for their works sake. Paul saith of Timothy, I have no man like minded. If those that heard not a Sermon in many years differed not from your Congregation, why do you preach?

I am reproached in Print for telling the world this notorious truth; That I lived till ten years old, where four men, four years hired successively were Readers and School-masters; two Preached (as it was called) once a Month, the other two never: Two drank themselves to beggery. After I lived where many Parishes about us had no Preachers: The Parish that I lived in, had a Church with a Vicar that never preached, and a Chappel with a Parson eighty years old, that had two Livings twenty Miles distant, and never preacht: His Son a Reader and Stage-player was sometime his Curate: His Grand-son, my School-master, his Curate next that, never preacht in his life, but drunk himself to beggery. One year a Taylor read the Scripture, and the old man (the best of them all) said the Common-Prayer without book (for want of sight.) The next year a poor Thresher read the Scripture. After that a Neighbours Son (my Master) was Curate, who never preacht but once, and that when he was drunk, (in my hearing) on *Mat. 23. Come ye Blessed, and go ye Cursed;*] the saddest Sermon that ever I heard. These things were no rarities: Now my assertion is, That the Church that had such as *Austin, Chrysostome, Jewel, Andrews,* and such worthy men as *London* now hath many, had Priviledges distinct from these, (and many the like) that I was in.

If you say that every Bishop and Preacher is as much the Bishop and Preacher to all other single Churches, as to that which is his Title; then  
 1. He must be condemned for not teaching them all. 2. Then he may claim maintenance from them all. 3. Then he may intrude into any mans Charge.  
 4. Then no Church is unchurcht for want of a Bishop, for any one Bishop is Bishop to every Church in the World; and so *ubi Episcopus ibi Ecclesia*, signifieth but that Church and Bishop are on the same Earth; and *Ecclesia est Plebs Episcopo adunata* may be verified if there be but one in the World. 5. And so Mr. *Dodwell* and such are self-confuted before you are aware: *Geneva, Holland,* and all Presbyterians are true Churches, for they have all Bishops; e.g. The Bishop of *London* is Bishop to them all: For if one man be no more a Member of one single Church than of another, and so no more a Subject to one Bishop than to another, then one Bishop is no more Pastor of one Church than of another.

7. And how can you magnifie the Church of *England* for a Wise, Learned, Pious Clergy above other Churches, if all Priviledges be common, and they have no proper Pastors of their own.

8. Do you think that the Church, e.g. Of *Hippo*, that was in *Austins* dayes, was the same numerical single Church with that which is there now,  
 (were



(were there any) or with the Diocesan Church of *London*? if not, then at least distance of time, and change of Persons maketh divers Particular Churches; and it's no more against the unity of the Church Universal to have divers particular Churches in it in the same Age, than in divers Ages.

In short, Diversity of matter and form maketh a numerical Diversity (as of Natural, so) of Politick Bodies of the same species: But the Churches of *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, *Thyatira*, *Philadelphia*, &c. were of divers matter and form numerically; Ergo they were divers Political Churches.

Sure God doth not commend *Laodicea* for *Philadelphia's* Church Virtues, nor condemn the Church of *Philadelphia* for the other Churches Sins.

And if the Angels be Bishops, why are some Bishops praised as the Bishops of such Churches, and the Bishops of other Churches threatned.

But I confess this is a ready way to end the Controversies between the Bishops of several Churches which shall be greatest, if they be all but one.

But I hope that when the Bishop of *Rome* and his Church was corrupted, it is not true that every Bishop and Church fell with him, (or with any that hath turned to Mahumetanism.)

To be no longer on this, (which I thought no Prelatist would ever have put me on) if these men speak not notoriously against Scripture, against the constant Language of Canons and Fathers, Historians and Lawyers, and all Antiquity, and all Christian Countreys and Divines, (yea, even those that at *Trem* would have had only the Pope to be of immediate Divine Right) then I know not any thing by Reading. And if poor Nonconformists must be put to defend themselves against such singularities, and be Schismatics unless they will differ from all the Christian World of all Ages, there is no Remedy.

§. 7. But p. 5, 6. he tells us, [that a Church is made by a Divine Covenant—God only can constitute a Church: Such Persons, if there be any so absurd, are not worth disputing with, who dare affirm the Church to be an humane Creature, or the invention of men.—And no Church can depend on humane Contracts; for then a Church would be a humane Creature and Constitution, whereas a Church can be founded only on a Divine Covenant—

1. Who would think but this man were a Nonconformist, that talks so like them (e. g. *Amesius* in *Medul. Theol.*) against humane Church Forms? But what then will Bishop *Bilson*, and almost all other Bishops and Christians be thought of, who affirm Patriarchal and Metropolitcal Churches (and many of the Diocesane) to be but humane Constitutions and Inventions. And if these be not worth the disputing with, it seems, that you differ from them more than Separatists do: and then were not all these Schismatics? and then, are not you a Schismatick if you communicate with them? yea, your Mr. *Dodwel* himself maketh Diocesan Churches to be a humane Creature; and A. Bishop *Bromhall* much pleadeth for mans power to make Patriarchal Churches; and so do such others.

2. But is it true that humane Contracts make not a Church? *Ans.* Not alone: But I think that all Churches are made by mutual Contracts, and humane is one part of that which is mutual.

I. As to the *Universal Church*, 1. God as Legillator and Donor, instituteth the *species* of Covenanting by Baptism, and therein he commandeth mans consent to his offered Covenant; and conditionally promiseth to be our God: But, *Conditionale nihil ponit in esse*: This much maketh no Christian, nor Church. To command a man to be a Christian, and conditionally to promise him life if he will be one, proveth him not to be one; else all were Christians that reject an offered Christ.

2. But when man consenteth and covenanteth with God, then Gods conditional gift becomes actual and efficacious, the man being a capable Recipient, and not before: and in this it is the Contract that is the *Fundamentum Relationis*; but a single Promise is not a mutual Covenant or Contract.

So that it is no wiser Divinity to say, Gods Covenant and not mans consent, Covenant or Contract with God, doth make Christians, and the universal Church; than It is sober Reason to say, That Gods Institution of Marriage or Magistracie only doth make the Relation of Husband and Wife, without their covenanting consent, or doth make Common-wealths, without the consent or Covenant of Sovereign and Subjects. Did this Doctor think that *Voluntariness* is not as necessary to the Relation of Christianity as to the Relation of Prince and Subjects; yea, or of Husband and Wife? if he do, he is shamefully mistaken. Baptism delivereth men possession of *Pardon, Grace* and *right* to Glory; and can men have this against their wills? One would think by the Doctrine and course of some men, that they could force men to Pardon and Salvation! if I believed that their force could accomplish this, I would never call it Persecution. If they can force men to be true Christians, they may force them to be justified and saved; and then they are very uncharitable if they do not: Let them then cease preaching and disputing us to their Opinion, but bring us all to Heaven whether we will or not.

Yea the self-contradictor, playing fast and loose, confesseth p. 6. That *no man at age can be admitted to Baptism, till he profess his faith in Christ, and voluntarily undertake the Baptismal Vow*: And is not that humane Covenanting?

Yea, he knoweth that the Liturgie maketh even Neighbours or Strangers, vow and covenant, both in the name of the Child and for the Child. And so necessary doth the Episcopal Church think humane Covenanting, that without this no Child must be Baptized publicly though the Parents would covenant, and that they can neither for Love nor Money (for many poor men hire Godfathers) get any one (much less three) who examined, will seriously purpose to perform the Covenant for the Childs holy Education which they make.

II. But

II. But is not *humane* Covenanting a cause of *single Church* Relation as well as of *universal*? I see no cause to doubt it; and I am sure that the Church for a thousand years (before and since Popery came in) have declared him no Bishop that comes in without *consent* of Clergie and People; which *Consent* is their covenanting act.

To make a single Church, manifold consent goeth to the *Fundamentum Relationis*. 1. God commandeth single Church Officers, order and consent, and promiseth them his blessing where they are met: The Lord and his Angels are among them: No command is vain, and without a virtual Promise. 2. To this a threefold humane consent is needful, Ordinarily: 1. the Persons called. 2. The Ordainers (when it may be had.) 3. The Peoples. He that formerly, from the Apostles dayes, for a thousand years, should have said, that neither the covenanting, that is the *consent* of the Pastor, or People, or Ordainers, is necessary to the *Fundamentum* of a single Church Relation or Form, would have been taken for a wild-brain'd Schismatick at least.

§. 8. But saith this Doctor (and another of them) [p. 6. *But the Independent Church Covenant between Pastor and people, is of a very different nature from this: Unless any man will say, that the voluntary Contract and Covenant which the Independents exact from their Members, and wherein they place a Church state, be part of the Baptismal vow; if it be not, then they found the Church upon a humane Covenant; for Christ hath made but one Covenant with Mankind which is contained in the Vow of Baptism; if it be, then no man is a Christian but an Independent.*

*Ans.* Alas for the Church that is taught at this rate!

1. I never saw what Independents do in this case; but I think none of them that are Sober own any other sort of Church but the *universal*, and *single Churches* as members of it, and therefore require no Contract but 1. To the Covenant of Baptism or Christianity. 2. To the Duties of their particular Church-relation.

2. And nothing is here of necessity but *manifested Consent* (which is a real Contract) but a clearer or a darker, an explicate or implicate consent differ only *ad melius esse*.

3. Is not God the Author of Magistracy, Marriage, &c. And is it any violation of Gods part, if Rulers and People, Husband and Wife be Covenanters by his command?

4. Is it any renuntiation of Baptism to promise at Ordination to obey the Arch-Bishop and Bishop, and to take the Oath of Canonical Obedience? Is it not still exacted? Are not the Takers of it obliged? are not Covenants imposed on all that will be Ministers in the act of Uniformity? are not multitudes kept out and cast out for not making these Covenants? *Quo reneam nodo*, &c. How should one deal with such slippery men? Good Mr. Zachary Cawdry that wrote to have all men to covenant Submission to Bishops

and Parish Ministers, did not dream that it was any violation of Baptism.

5. Do not men owe duty to their Pastors which they owe to no others? If not, put them not on it: Why are you angry with them for going from you? Why doth the Canon suspend those that receive them to Communion from another Parish that hath no Preacher? Why are we ruined for not covenanting as aforesaid? if yea, then is it against Baptism to promise to do our duty?

6. But hath God commanded or instituted no Covenant but Baptism? Yes sure, the Matrimonial at least; and I think Ordination is covenanting for the Ministry: Did not the Apostle *Acts* 14. 23. ordain Elders in every Church? if you would have [by *Suffrage*] left out of the Translation, no sober man can doubt but it was by the Peoples consent; and was it without their consent that *Titus* was to ordain Elders in every City? Could any then come otherwise in? Did not all Churches hold and practise this after, and was it none of Gods Institution? If so, God requireth us not to take any of you for our Bishops or Pastors: Who then requireth it? What meaneth *Paul* when he saith, *they gave up themselves to the Lord and to us, by the Will of God.*

7. Can the wit of man imagine how it is possible without consent, for a man to be made the Pastor of any Flock? Who ever ordained a man against his will? or for any man to have Title against his will, to the proper oversight and pastoral care of any one Pastor, or the priviledges of any Church? If any think they may be cramm'd and drencht with the Sacrament, or that an unwilling man may have a sealed pardon and gift of Salvation delivered him, he will make a new Gospel. And how any particular Pastor is bound to give that man the Sacrament ordinarily, that consents not ordinarily to receive it of him, I know not. No man is a member of any City, or any Company of Free-men in the City, but by mutual consent; and the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy to the King maketh not the Oath of a Citizen as such or of a Member of a Company as such, unlawful.

8. Doth this Doctor think that he ever yet proved to sober men, that the Covenant aforesaid, of Godfathers and Godmothers, to make Christians, and members of the universal Church, is more (or so much) of Gods Institution, than the Contract or Consent between Bishops or Pastors and People to make a single Political Church?

9. If it follow not, that no man is the Kings Subject that sweareth not to the City; It will not follow, that none is a Christian, but an Independent, or Church-consenter.

10. How are your Parish or Diocefan Church members known to your selves or any others? Are all that dwell in the Parish or Diocefs your Church members? Then Atheists, Sadducees, Hobbists, and all vicious men and thousands that never communicate are such: Yea those that you call Separatists.



If it be every transient Communicant, have you a proper Pastoral care of every Travellers Soul that so communicates with you? You after plead that his very ordinary Communion maketh him not a member, if he be unwilling to be one. And is not his consent then necessary? Or if ordinary Communion be the test (how few then of great Parishes are of the Church) yet that is because such Communion signifieth their Consent to your oversight of them.

§. 9. But it's much to be approved which p. 5. and oft he saith, that *to be taken into Covenant with God, and to be received into the Church is the very same thing*, as to the Universal Church. By which all his gross Schismatical Accusations afterwards are confuted. No man then is out of the Church that is not out of the Baptismal Covenant, either by not taking it, or by renouncing some *Essential part* of it? And when will he prove, that to take him, rather than Dr. Bates that was cast out, to be a Teacher or Pastor at *Dunstons*, or to take this man and not another to be the Lawful Bishop or Priest, and to obey him in every Oath and Ceremony, is an *Essential part* of the Baptismal Covenant, or of Christianity? But such a rope of Sand, as Mr. Dodwell and this man tie together, to bind men to their Sect, will serve turn with some that know not who speaks Truth, by any surer way than prejudice.

§. 10. His Doctrine of Separation and gathering Churches out of Churches is anon to be considered: But whereas he addes, p. 7. [*These men convert Christians from common Christianity, and the Communion of the Universal Church to Independency.*]

*Ans.* My acquaintance with them is small, save by reading their Books: And there are few Men of any Common Denomination (Episcopal, or other) that are not in many things disagreed. But I must in Charity to them say, that as far as I can judge by their Writings or Speech, he palpably slandereth them; and that none that are grave and sober among them do separate their Churches from the common Christianity or the Universal Church, any more than the Company of Stationers, Ironmongers, &c. are separated from the City of London, or London from England; or Trinity Colledge from the University of Cambridge or Oxford. I never met with man, and I am confident never shall do, that doth not take his Independent Church to be part of the Universal, and Dependent as a part on the whole. If belying others stopt at words, the wrong were small: But when it's made but the stairs to hatred and destroying, it's his way to cute Schism that is commonly painted with Horns and Cloven feet. If a man come from a Country Village and be made by Covenant a Citizen of London, how prove you that he renounceth King or Kingdom?

But he saith, p. 9. *Those who wilfully separate from the Corporation to which the Charter was granted, forfeit their Interest in the Charter.*

*Ans.* What Reader doth this man presume upon that will not ask him, how he proveth it? That Gods Law or Charter to his Church doth not require



quire them to congregate in distinct single Churches (as *London Charter* doth to erect several Companies, and the Universities several Colledges?) 2. And that God hath not in his Word given order or command for such single Churches: But that the Apostles and *They* by fixing Elders to their several Churches and Cities, separated from the Universal Church? 3. And that their subordinate Churches have not need of distinct subordinate consent and duty: And that our Diocesan Churches all separate from the Universal? Did he think these things need no proof at all?

It may be he will say that the *Diocesan* depend on the *Universal*, but the *Presbyterian* or *Independent* do not.

I Answer, Dependence is either that of *Subjects* on *Sovereign* or *Magistrates* for *Government*, or that of a *Community* of *Equals* for *Communion*. In the former respect they depend on none but Christ as Universal Sovereign, Nor on any Foriegners for Governments: In the latter, they depend on all true Churches for Communion: And Doctor *Hammond* and most *Diocesans* hitherto have said that *Diocesan* Churches are thus far *Independent* or *National* at most.

And if any be for a *Forreign Jurisdiction*, in Charity before they perswade *England* to it, they should procure them a Dispensation from all the Oaths, that have sworn all this Kingdom against endeavouring any change of Government, and against a *Forreign Jurisdiction*: For some Fanaticks now Dream that *P E R* is the Mark of the Beast, and that  $\chi \xi \epsilon$  (which is the number of his Name, is nominal as well as numeral, and refers to [*CH*-urch  $\chi$  (and) *S*tate]) (For as for them that find a *mans* name in them, I abhor their Exposition more.)

§. 11. P. 9. [God (saith he) hath not made any Covenant in particular with the Church of Geneva, France or England, &c.]

A. 1. God hath made one General Law, for Christians congregating with their fixed Elders or Bishops in particular Churches all the World over: And his Command is not without Promise of being with them to the End of the World; and that Promise becometh a Promise to every Church so congregate. God hath not made distinct Laws or Promises to every Christian: But the Promise to Justifie all Believers justifieth each single Person when he believeth. If the King should make one common Law to command all his Subjects that are Freeholders to live in Corporations or Hundreds, described with their priviledges, those priviledges would be all theirs that are so incorporated: As one Charter may Priviledge every *London* Company, diversified by subordinate Agreements.

2. And that God who will have them thus incorporated and distributed into several single Churches, doth Covenant (or Promise) according to their demerits to each. Do I need to recite the peculiar Promises and threats to the seven *Asian* Churches, *Rev.* 2. and 3. which are Covenants to them?

§. 12. Next *Page* 10. He will tell us what *Communion* is, and in many

not atto-

words, it is to tell us that *Communion is nothing but Union*: I know that *quoad notationem nominis*, *Communion* may signifie, *Union with others*: But they that write *Politicks* have hitherto distinguished *Union* and *Communion*, taking *Communion* for *Actual Communication*, or exercise of the duties of men in *Union*? But to speak cross to other Writers on the same Subjects and give no reason for it, and to confound *Union* and *Communion*, is one part of this edifying Resolution.

§. 13. Pag. 11. [*Our Communion with the Church consists in being members of the Church, which we are made by Baptism,*] (saith he.)

Then the Baptized are still in *Communion* with the Church, till their baptism be nullified: And hath he proved us Apostates?

§. 14. Pag. 12. *Should any man who is no member of the Church, nor owns himself to be so, intrude into the Church and Communicate in all Holy Offices, it's no Act of Communion, &c.*

A. I thought communicating ordinarily in Holy Offices, had gone for an owning of *Communion*: If it do not, would you would tell us how to know who are of your Church.

§. 15. P. 13. Saith he (*Church-Communion does not consist in particular Acts of Communion, which can be performed among those who are present and Neighbours, but in membership: Now as a member is a member of the whole Body (not meerly of any part of it, &c.) All the Subjects of England who never saw nor converse with each other, are members of the same Kingdom.*)

A. 1. That word [*meerly*] hath more Craft than Justice or Honesty: *Meerly* signifieth Only I suppose; and if he would make his Reader think that they that are for *single Church peculiar membership* and consent, do take themselves to be [*meerly or only*] members of those single Churches, and not of the Universal, it is shameful injury.

2. Will he ever draw men to conformity by making them believe, that because they owe *Common Communion* to all Christians, therefore we owe no special duty to the Bishops, Priests, Churches or Neighbours where we are settled? Do the Men of one Colledge, School, Corporation, owe no more duty to that than to all others? Do the Free-holders of *Bedfordshire* choose Knights for *Middlesex*; or the Citizens of *Oxford* choose Officers in *London*? These seem strange Resolutions to us.

3. But doth he remember that [*if Communion consist not in Acts of Communion to such, but in membership even with the distant,*] then he that is baptized, and no Apostate, and performeth no other Acts of *Communion* to the Bishops, Parson or People where he liveth, than he is bound to perform to them a hundred or thousand miles off, is no Separatist. Methinks this favours Separation too much.

§. 16. Pag. 14. When he denied any Divine Covenant to make us members of particular Churches distinguish't from the Universal (as all National, Diocesan and Parochial are, as parts from the whole) he presently confuteth all again, saying [*The exercise of Church Communion as to most of the parti-*

cular duties and Offices of it must be confined to a particular Church and Congregation (for we cannot actually joyn in the Communion of Prayers and Sacraments, &c. but with some particular Church.)

A. *Oportuit fuisse memorem*, — 1. Reader, doth not this man here confess that there are particular Churches? 2. If these be not distinct from the whole, then each particular is the whole. 3. If the Exercise must be in particular Churches, must not men Consent to their Relations and Duties? Is it a sin to Promise Duty? 4. Sure it is not meer Place, but a mutual Relation of Pastors and People that distinguisheth these Churches. The Presbyterians preach't once in the same Places that you do, and yet you take them not for the same Church Pastors. If one from York or Cornwall come into your Pulpit without consent, do People stand as much related to him as to you? Some men are of extraordinary sufficiency to resist and conquer the clearest evidence of Truth.

But he addes [every Act of Communion tho performed to some particular Church, is and must be an Act of Communion with the whole Catholick Church.]

A. And who denyeth this? No sober Independent or Presbyterian that ever I met with. It's a weighty Truth.

§. 17. P. 14. Saith he [Praying, and Hearing and Receiving the Lords Supper together doth not make us more in Communion with the Church of England than with any other true and Orthodox part of the Church, tho in the remotest part of the World.]

A. I think that's not true: With the remotest parts you have only Catholick Communion with the Church Universal: In England and London you have that and more; even special subordinate Communion with your own King, Bishop and Flock.

2. And hath not the Church of England such Communion in obedience to its own Laws; (as the Act of Uniformity,) Convocation and Canons, which you have not with all abroad? Do your Bishops in Convocation make Canon Laws for all the World? Do you Swear Canonical obedience as much to the Bishop of Paris, or Haffnia, &c. as to your Ordinary? Do the Canons of all Churches impose our Liturgy, or *ipso facto* excommunicate all that affirm any thing in it, or our Ceremonies or Church Government, to be against Gods word? Sure this is a peculiar kind of Communion.

3. If not, why are all the Nonconformists cast out that offer to officiate and communicate on such terms as are common to all sound Churches?

Pag. 15. Saith he [There is nothing in all these Acts of Communion which does more peculiarly unite us to such a particular Church than to the whole Christian Church.]

A. What, neither in these Acts nor any other! Then we are no more bound to hear you, or maintain you as our Pastor, than to hear and maintain the whole Christian Church.

§. 18. P. 20. Saith he [There is no other Rule of Catholick Communion for  
private

private Christians, but to communicate in all Religious Offices and all Acts of Government and Discipline with Christians those with whom they live.

A. 1. Elsewhere you added [*Sound and Orthodox*:] Else they that live with Arians, Socinians, Papists (in Spain, France, Italy, &c.) are bound to communicate with them in all Religious Offices and obey them. 2. This concludeth, that where Presbytery or Independency is the way of the place where we live, all must thus communicate and obey. The King and Custom then may make any way to become our Duty. 3. If you tell us that it's only with the *Sound and Orthodox*, you were as good say nothing, unless you tell us who must judge that, whether the People themselves, or who for them. 4. But if this be the only rule for private Christians, what shall they do, e. g. in *Ethiopia, Egypt, Syria*, and many other Countreys where the Churches are such as General Councils and other Churches judge Hereticks or Schismatics? And what shall they do, when at *Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople*, &c. one party is uppermost (by the Judgment of Councils and Prince) one Year, and another contrary party the next. And what shall they do where the Prince equally tolerateth both, and it's hard to know which is the more numerous? as in *Zeno's and Anastasius* Reign, &c. And what shall they do when many Churches in one City are of divers Tongues, as well as Customs? Have the *Greeks, French and Dutch* in *London* no rule of Catholick Communion but communicating in all Offices with the English, and obeying all your Bishops Courts?

§. 19. P. 21. Saith he [*Distinct and particular Churches which are in Communion with each other, must have their distinct bounds and limits, as every member has it's natural and proper place, and Situation in the Body.*]

A. Why may not the *Greeks, Dutch and French* live in Communion with the Churches *London* though they live dispersedly among them! In *Brandenburg, Hassia*, and many free Cities, and *Belgia*, where Lutherans and Calvinists (as called) live together, and own each other as Brethren, why may not both be Churches of Christ?

§. 20. P. 21, 22. A great deal more he hath of the like, making Schismatics at his Pleasure. [*This is plain in the Case of the Presbyterian and Independent Churches and those other Conventicles — They are Churches in a Church, — Nothing can justify the Distinction of Christians into several Churches, but only such a distance of place as makes it necessary, &c. p. 22. Distinct Churches in the same place can never be under the same Communion.*]

A. These things are repeated so oft, and the word [*separate*] so deceitfully rolled over and over, that I will answer all together under his third Case at the End.

§. 21. P. 27. See how openly he recanteth most afore said: "*There is a fence indeed wherein we may be said to be members of one particular Church considered as distinct from all other particular Churches: But that principally consists in Government and Discipline. Every Christian is a member of the Whole*"



*“Christian Church, and in Communion with it, but he is under the immediate instruction and Government of his own Bishop and Presbyters, and is bound to personal Communion with them; and this constitutes a particular Church, in which all Acts of Worship and all Acts of Discipline and Government are under the Direction and conduct of a particular Bishop.”]*

*A.* Omitting that he seemeth to make the Parochial Churches no Churches, but parts of one, here he saith all that he seemed to write against, and that those that he reproacheth hold, allowing the difference of the extent of Churches. And is it Edifying to read such a discourse, that faith and unfaith by self-contradiction? And he adjoyns 28. p. how by agreement Patriarchal and National Churches are made! And is not Agreement a humane Contract?

## CHAP. II.

### *Of his first Case.*

**S. 1.** *P* *Ape* 31. His first Case, *“Whether Communion with some Church or other be a necessary Duty incumbent on Christians:”* And he thinks *“the Resolution of this is as plain, as whether it be necessary for every man to be a Christian: For every Christian is baptized into the Communion of the Church.”*

*A.* In this I know no Christian adversary to him: But it being the Universal Church that he giveth his proof of necessary Communion with, it's odde to say, *We must have Communion with some Church or other:* As if there were more than one Universal Church. 2. But we grant more, that all that can well, should be also members of some single Church.

**S. 2.** *P.* 32. He saith [*“External and Actual Communion is an Essential duty of a Church-member (meaning a Christian.)”*]

*A.* 1. And yet before he denied that Communion lay essentially in this Exercise, but only in Union: Yea and Nay is his Custom. 2. Some few Christians (as those that live where such Communion cannot be had without sin, &c.) are not bound to it; therefore it is not true that it is Essential to Universal Church-membership. And I think sickness endeth not the essentials, that disableth men.

3. Note Reader, that by this mans Doctrine we are all unchristened and damned if we do not gather into disallowed Churches, if we be unjustly cast out of the allowed ones: For all must be Church members that will be Christians, and an unjust Excommunication cannot disoblige us from Christianity, nor bind us to consent to be damned. Now read the 5<sup>th</sup> 6<sup>th</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> 8<sup>th</sup>, &c. Canons of the Church of England, which ipso facto Excommunicate all that affirm any thing in their Liturgy, Articles, Ceremonies or Government.



ment sinful, and answer *Spalensis* arguments against Excommunicating *ipso facto*, and prove all this just, and you may prove what you will just. But you see where he layeth the Controversie: If any be Excommunicated without sufficient cause, or by Lay Civilians to whom God never gave that power, or by such Bishops or Pastors as have no just Authority for want of a true call or Consent; or if any unlawful thing be made necessary to Communion, all such persons must by his own confessions hold Church-communion whether these imposers will or not; for all Christians are bound to be of some Church.

S. 3. p. 33, 34. He saith that [*None but publick Prayers are the Prayers of the Church properly, and acts of Communion, that is, such as are offered by the hands of men authorized and set apart for that purpose, &c.*]

*Ans.* Who would have thought that we are more for the Liturgy than he? I undertake to prove, that all the Responsal Prayers, and all the Litaney Prayers, in which the Minister names but the matter to them, and the People make it a Prayer by speaking the petitioning parts, are all the publick Prayers of the Church, and so are all the petitioning Psalms spoke or sung by the People, and not only that which is offered by the Priest: I do not think that he believeth what he carelessly saith here, himself.

But the Independents are stiffer for his first *Thesis* (of the necessity of Church-communion) than he is, his unfit words I pass by.

### CHAP. III.

#### *Of his second Case.*

S. 1. **T**HE next question of *Occasional Communion* as distinct from fixed, he turns out of doors, as if there could be no such thing, and it's very true as to the Church universal; but as to visible, actual Communion with this or that particular Church, it is not true.

1. A Traveller of another Country, who on his journey communicateth with every Church where he passeth, is not a fixed Member of that Church: for, 1. The Pastor or Bishop hath not that peculiar Charge of him as of fixed members. 2. He is not bound where he passeth to take such notice of the lives of Communicants or Pastors, and to admonish the Offenders, and tell the Church, as fixed members are. 3. He hath not the right in choosing Pastors or Deacons as the fixed Members have. 4. An itinerant Bishop *in transitu* is not their fixed Bishop; ergo an Itinerant Lay-man is not a fixed Member.

The same I may say of one that is a fixed member of another Church in the same City, and cometh to that only to signify universal Communion, or

neighbourly ; which, though he deny to be lawful, I shall further prove anon.

And the same I may say of those that dwell where there is no fixed single Church at all, for want of a Pastor, but they congregate only when some strange Minister passeth through the Town.

#### CHAP. IV.

##### *His third Case.*

S. 1. **P**AGE 48, 49. He resolveth his third Case: [*Whether it be lawful to Communicate with two distinct and separate Churches*] negatively, and saith, [*It is contrary to all the Principles of Church Communion, as any thing can possibly be; it is to be contrary to our selves, it is Communicating with Schism: That the Presbyterian and Independent Churches have made an actual separation from the Church of England be hath evidently proved;— and they are Schismaticke, and to communicate with them is to partake in their Schism; and if Schism be a great sin, and that which will damn us as soon as Adultery and Murder, then it must needs be a dangerous thing to communicate with Schismaticke.* And p. 42. *There cannot be two distinct Churches in one place, one for occasional, and another for constant Communion, without Schism.*]

*Ans.* To save those that are willing from the Poyson of these Schismatical Doctrines, lapt up in confusion by men that abhor distinction, or understand not what they say; I will first lay down that truth that he fights against, with convincing evidence, and then shew you the mischief of his false Doctrine and Application.

S. 2. The confusion of these words [*Church, Communion, Separation and Schism*] which every one signifie divers things, is the chief means to blind and deceive his Reader; whether it do so by himself I know not.

I. The Word *Church* signifieth sometime the universal Church; sometime a single Organized Church as part of it, and sometime humane combinations of such single Churches; and that into Diocesan, Classial, Provincial, Patriarchal, National, and Papal.

II. The Specification and Nomination of Churches is from the formal cause, and the proper Government is that form: And the Individuation is from matter and form, but principally from the form.

III. The Union of Pastor and Flock in Relation makes that which is a form aptitudinal (as the Soul to the Body) to be the form in act (as the Union of Soul and Body) and Gods command and consent with the consent of the necessary relate and correlate cause that union.

IV. Union is in order to Communion, which is primary by the exercise

of the formal powers on the matter, and secondary by the action of all the parts according to their several capacities and Offices.

V. The Union of the Church is of divers degrees. 1. The formal Union of the Head and Body, which maketh it essentially the [*Christian Church.*]

2. The *Union of the parts among themselves as Christian*, which maketh them a *Body* capable of Union with the Head. 3. The Union of the parts as unequal Organized, the Official with the rest, which maketh it an *Organized Body*, fit for its special use and welfare. 4. Union in *integrity* of parts, which maketh it an *intire Body*. 5. Union in due temperament and Qualities, which maketh it a *healthful Body*. 6. Unity in *Commou Accidents*, which make it a *Comely Beautiful Body* joined with the rest. But, 7. Union in mutable Accidents is unnecessary and impossible.

VI. These several degrees of Union are found in Bodies natural and Politick. 1. The Union of Soul and Body makes a man, and an Embryo before it be organized. 2. The Union of the Body maketh it capable of the Souls further Operation. 3. The Union of the Organical, chief parts, (as Heart, Lungs, &c.) to the rest make it a true humane Body compleated to the nutriment and action of Life. 4. That it have Hands and Fingers, Feet and Toes, and all integral parts, makes it an *intire Body*. 5. The due site, temperament and qualities of each part make it a *sound Body*. 6. Comely colour, hair, action, going, speech, &c. make it a *comely Body*. 7. To have all parts of equal quantity and office, would make it *uncomely*: And to have the same hair, colour, &c. is unnecessary at all.

1. The Union of King and Subjects as such makes a Kingdom. 2. That the People be agreed; for one conjunct interest and Government maketh them a *Community* capable of Politic or Government. 3. That there be Judges, Maiors and Justices, and subordinate Cities or Societies, maketh it an *Organized Body*, in which Kingly Government may be exercised to its end, the common good. 4. That no profitable part be wanting, (Judge, Justice, Sheriff, &c.) maketh it an *entire Kingdom*. 5. That all know their place, and be duly qualified with Wisdom, Love, Justice, Conscience, Obedience to God first, to the Sovereign Power next, to Officers next, &c. maketh it a *sound and safe Kingdom*. 6. That it be well situate, fertile, rich, eminent in Learning, Skill, &c. maketh it an *adorned beautiful Kingdom*. 7. That all be equal in Power and wealth is destructive; and that all be of one Age, complexion, calling, temper, degree of knowledge, &c. is impossible: And that all have the same language, cloathing, utensils, &c. is needless at least.

VII. Jesus Christ is the only Universal Sovereign of the Church, both of vital influence and Government; nor hath he set up any under him, either Monarchical, Aristocratical, Democratical, or mixt, Pope, Council, or diffused Clergy, that hath the Power of Legislation and Judgment as governing the whole Chorch; but only Officers that *per paxes* govern it a-

mong

mong them, each in his Province, as Justices do the Kingdom, and Kings and States the World ; nor is any capable of more.

VIII. To set up any *universal Legislators* and Judge, (Pope or Council) is to set up an Usurper of Christs Prerogative, called by many a Vice-Christ or an Antichrist ; and as bad as making one man or Senate the Sovereign of all the Earth ; and to attempt the setting up of such or any *foreign Jurisdiction* in this Land, is to endeavour to perjure the whole Kingdom that is sworn against it in the Oath of Supremacy, and sworn never to endeavour any alteration of Government in Church or State in the Corporation Oath, the Vestry Oath, the *Militia* Oath, the *Oxford* Oath, with the Uniformity Covenants : And if any should endeavour to introduce such a foreign Jurisdiction who themselves have had a hand in driving all the Kingdom to all these Oaths against it, I doubt whether all the Powers of Hell can devise a much greater crime against Clergy, Cities, and all the Land. Good reason therefore had Doctor *Isaac Barrow* to write against it as he hath done, and to confute Mr. *Thorndike*, and all such as of late go that pernicious way, by the presence of Church Union and Communion. As if one universal Sovereign and Legislator and Judge, were not enough to unite Christs Kingdom, or man could mend his universal Laws, and could not stay for his final judgment ; and Churches and Kingdomes might not till then be ruled without one humane universal Sovereign by necessary and voluntary agreement among themselves.

XI. To be a true Believer or Christian, ( or the Infant seed of such ) devoted to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the sense of the Baptismal Covenant, uniteth each Member first to Christ himself directly, and consequently to his Body or Church ; and this *coram Deo*, as soon as it is done by heart consent ; and *coram Ecclesia*, regularly, as soon as he is invested by Baptism ; which Baptism, when it may be had so, is regularly to be administered by none but an authorized Minister or Deacon ; but if through necessity or mistake it be done by a Lay-man, the Ancient Christians took it not for a nullity, much less if the Baptizer was taken for a Minister by mistake, being in his place ; and if no Baptism can be had, open covenanting is vallid.

X. The Papists ( and their truckling Agents here ) have here hampered themselves in a fatal contradiction : To make themselves masters of the World, they would perswade us, that Sacraments only regenerate and sanctifie, and that God saveth none ( by any known way and grant ) but by his Covenant Sealed by the Sacraments ; and that he authorizeth none to administer this Covenant but Prelates and their Priests, and none can validly have it from other hands : And so if you will but abate them the proof of many things that stand in the way, Heaven and Hell, Salvation and Damnation are at the will and mercy of such Prelates and Priests. But unhappily they cannot retrieve their old Opinion, but maintain that Laymen



men and Women may baptize in necessity validly, and that Baptism puts one into a State of Salvation.

XI. As he that swears and keeps his Allegiance to the King is a Subject and Member of the Kingdom, though he be no Member of any Corporation; so, though he disown a thousand fellow Subjects; yea, though he deny the Authority of Constable, Justice, Judge; so he that is devoted to Christ truly in the Baptismal Covenant, is a Christian, and a Member of the Universal Church, though he were of no particular Church, or did disown a thousand Members, or any particular Officer of the Church.

XII. All faults or crimes are not Treason: A man that breaketh any Law, is in that measure Culpable or punishable: but every breach of Law, or wrong to fellow Subjects or Justices, as it is not Treason, so it doth not prove a man no Subject; though some may be so great as to deserve death and make him intolerable: And so it is in the case of our Subjection in the Church to Christ.

XIII. To own Christs Instituted *species* of Church Officers is needful to the just Order, Safety and Edification of the Church (as to own the Courts of Judicature, Justices, &c. in the Kingdom) but to own this or that *numerical* Officer as truly commissioned, is needful only to the right administration of his own Province.

XIV. As Christ did his own work of *universal Legislation* by himself and his *Spirit* eminently in the Apostles and Evangelists, who have recorded all in Scripture, so he settled Churches to continue to the end associated for Personal Communion in his holy *Doctrine, Worship, Order* and *Conversation* with authorized Ministers, subordinate to his administration in his *Prophetical, Priestly, Kingly* and *Friendly* Relations. And tho these may not always or often meet in the same place, their neighbourhood maketh them capable of *Personal* presential Communion, as men that may know and admonish each other and meet by turns, and in presence manage their concerns; which differenceth single Churches of the lowest order from associated Churches of men, that have Communion only by others at distance.

XV. As Logicians say of other Relations, the *matter* must be capable of the *end*, or it is not capable of the name and form; so is it here: *e.g.* It is no *Ship* that is made of meer Sponge or Paper, or that is no bigger than a Spoon; it is no Spoon that is as big as a Ship: One House is not a Village, nor one Village a City, nor a City a meer House. So twenty or an hundred, or a thousand Parishes associate, cannot be a *single Church* of the *first* or *lowest* Order, being not capable of *mutual Knowledge, Converse* or *personal present Communion*: Nor are two or three Lay-men capable to be such a Church, for want of due matter. But supposing them capable, tho a *full* and *rich* Church have advantage for *Honour* and *Strength*, yet a *small* and *poor* one is *ejusdem ordinis* as truly a Church; and so is their Pastor, as *Hierom* saith of *Rome* and *Eugenium*; so *Alexandria* and *Majuma*, &c. *Gregory Neocesar* was equally;

equally Bishop of nineteen at first, as after of all save nineteen in the City.

XVI. If the Apostles have Successours in their care and Superiority over many Churches, it will prove that there should yet be men of eminent worth to take care of many Churches, and to instruct and admonish the younger Ministers: But it will neither prove 1. That they succeed the Apostles in the extraordinary parts of their Office. 2. Nor that they have any forcing power by the Sword. 3. Nor that one Church hath power over others by Divine right; for the Apostles fixed not their power to any particular Churches, but were general *Visitors* or Overseers of many: Yet if the same Man who is fixed in a particular Church, have also the *visiting admonishing oversight* of many as far as was an Ordinary part of the Apostles Office, and be called an Archbishop, I know no Reason to be against him.

XVII. There be *essential* and *Integral* Acts of the Sacred Ministry instituted by Christ: These none may take the Power of from any Ministers, nor alter the *species* or *integrity* of the Office, by setting up any such Superiours as shall deprive them of that which Christ hath instituted, or arrogating the like uncalled. But as in *worship*, so in *Order* and *Church Government*, there are undetermined accidents: As to choose the time and place of Synods, to preside and moderate and such like: And these the Churches by agreement, or the Magistrate may assign to some above the rest: And if the Magistrate affix Baronies, Honours, Revenues, or his own due Civil forcing Power, and make the same Men Magistrates and Ministers, whether we think it prudent and well done or not, we must honour and obey them.

XVIII. Some call these *humane Accidental Orders*, *forms of Church Government*, and affirm (as Bishop Reignolds did, and Dr. Stillingfleet in his *Irenicon* and many excellent men by him cited) that no *form* of Church Government is of *Divine Command*. Which is true of all this second sort of Government which is but Accidental and humane; but not at all of the first sort which is Divine and Essential to Christ himself first, and to Pastors as such by his appointment; so that the essential Government of the Universal Church, by Christ, and of each particular Church by Pastors specified by him (if not of Supervisors of many as succeeding Apostles and Evangelists in their Ordinary work) are of unalterable Divine right. But the humane forms are alterable: Such I account 1. The Presidency and Moderatorship and accidental Government of one Bishop in a single Church over the other Presbyters, Deacons, &c. 2. The accidental Government of a Diocesan as an Archbishop over these lowest Bishops and Churches. 3. And the Superiority of Metropolitans and Patriarchs over them, so it be but in such *Accidentals* and within the same *Empire*, not imposing a foreign Jurisdiction. These *vera specie* differ from the Divine Offices.

XIX. All these single Church being parts of the Universal are less noble than the whole, and are to do all that they do as members in Union with the Whole, and to do all as Acts of Communion with them.

XX. The

XX. The General precepts of doing all to Edification, Concord, Peace, Order, &c. oblige all the Churches to hold such correspondencies as are needful to these Ends: And Synods are one special means, which should be used as far and oft as the Ends require; And if National Metropolitans and Patriarchs order such Synods, I am not one that will disobey them. But if on these pretences any would make Synods more necessary than they are, and use them as Governours, by Legislation and Judgement over the Particular Bishops by the use of the Church Keyes, and will affixe to them or Metropolitans, besides an *Agreeing Power* and the said Government in Accidentals, a proper Church Government by *making and unmaking Ministers or Christians, excommunicating and absolving* as Rulers by the said Keyes, it may be a duty to disown such usurpations: As the King would disown an Assembly of Princes any where met that would claim a Proper Government of him and his Kingdom; Tho' it were much to be wisht that all Christian Princes would hold such Assemblies for the Concord and Peace of Christendom.

XXI. The Essentials of Faith, Hope and Loving Practice, essentiate the Church objectively: And these are all summarily contained in the Baptismal Covenant, explained in the Creed, Lords Prayer and Decalouge; and all with much more, even Integrals and needful Accidentals in the Sacred Scriptures, which taking in the Law of Nature, are Gods Universal Law.

XXII. There is no Church on Earth so sound and Orthodox as to want no Integral part of Christian Religion: Proved: There is no man on Earth, much less any multitude, so sound as to want no Integral part: But all Churches consist only of Men; And therefore if all the Men be so far defective, all the Churches are so.

It is not their *Objective Religion* Generally and implicitly received that I mean, but their *Subjective Religion*, and their explicite reception of the Objective. The Scripture is our perfect Objective Religion in it self, and as an Object proposed, and in general and implicitly we all receive it. But as a man may say, I believe all that's in the Scripture, and yet be ignorant of the very Essentials in it; so a man may explicitly know and believe all the Essentials and more, and yet be ignorant of many Integrals.

All things in Scripture proposed to our Faith, Hope and Practice, are the Integrals of our Religion: But no Christian understandeth all these proposals or words of Scripture: Therefore no Christian explicite believeth them all, or practiceth all. To hold the contrary, is to hold that some Church is perfect in Understanding, Faith, Hope and Practice, without Ignorance, Errour or Sin: that is, not to know what a man or a Christian on Earth is.

XXIII. Much less do all Churches agree in unnecessary indifferent accidents, nor ever did, nor ever will or can do.

XXIV. The measuring out Churches by limits of Ground, Parochial or Diocesane, is a meer humane ordering of a mutable accident, and no Divine Determination: And if all were taken for Church members because they dwell

dwell in those precincts, it were wicked: But if it be but all in those precincts that are qualified Consenters, it is usually a convenient measure: But such as in many Cases must be broken.

XXV. If a Church with Faithful Pastors be well settled in a place first where there are not more than should make up that one Church, it is not meet for any there to gather a distinct Church (tho of the same Faith) without such weighty reason as will prove it necessary, or like to do more good than hurt: 1. Because Love inclineth to the greatest Union; 2. Because a Great Church is more strong and honourable than a small, if the number be not so great as to hinder the Ends. 3. And the Ancient Churches kept this Union.

XXVI. If Magistrates make such Laws about Church Accidents as tend to further the Churches wellfare, or are so pretended, and not against it, we must obey them. But if they will either invade Christs Authority or cross it, by making Laws against his, or such as are proper to his Prerogative to make, or invade the Pastors Office, and the Churches proper right given by Christ, or determine Accidents to the Destruction of the Substance (the Church, Doctrine, Worship or Ends) these bind the Consciences of none to Obedience; but Christ must be obeyed, and we must patiently suffer.

XXVII. Self-interest, Self-Government and Family-Government are all antecedent to Publick Government, which Ruleth them for the Common good, but hath no Authority to destroy them: No King or Prelate can bind a man to do that which would damn his Soul, nor to omit that which is needful to his Salvation: All power is for Edification: They are Gods Ministers for Good.

XXVIII. As it belongs to self-government to choose our own Dyet, and Cloaths, and Wives, and Physicians, (tho we may be restrained from doing publick hurt on such pretences;) And it belongs to Family Government to educate our own Children, and choose their Tutors, Callings, Wives, &c. so it more nearly belongs to self-government to choose the most safe and profitable means of our own Salvation, which no man may forbid us; and to avoid that which is pernicious or hurtful; and to Family-Government to do the like for our Children.

XXIX. It is false Doctrine of those late Writers who tell us, that only Sacraments sanctifie or give right to Salvation: The whole Tenor of the Gospel tells us that men are brought to Faith and Repentance, and to be Christians, and Godly men, and by Faith to be justified, by the Preaching of the Gospel: and that Gods word is his appointed means of Salvation, which his Ministers must preach skilfully, instantly, in season and out of season, to that End: And if the Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost.

XXX. The Gospel saveth not like a Charm, by the bare sound or saying of the words; nor the Sacrament like an Amulet; But as a Moral means (specially blest by him that instituted it) to work on man as Man, by informing



ming his Mind, perswading his Will and exciting his Affections, as Men are wrought on in other Cases; (which methinks those called Arminians should least deny, who are said to lay more of the Spirits operation on Moral situation than their Adversaries; yea and those that account it Fanaticism to expect any other gift of Prayer from the Spirit but what is given morally by use.) And the contrary Doctrine feigneth God to Work even constantly by Miracle: And as the Papists make every Mass-Priest a Miracle Worker in Transubstantiation, so do they that make the bare saying over the Words and doing the outward Acts in the Sacrament, to save us *ex opere operato*, and the Pastoral teaching and oversight of an ignorant drunken Lad or Reader to be (near) as great a help to Salvation, as the Ministry of a wise skilful, Holy and exemplary Pastor, and the clear affectionate Preaching of Gods word: And that tell us (as Mr. *Dodwell*) how sufficient a man is to administer the Sacramental Covenant that understands what a Covenant is in matters of Common Conversation.

XXXI. If a Wife and Skilful and Conscionable Ministry be as needless to Edification and Salvation as some Men pretend, it is as needless that they should study to be such, and vain to Glory that they are such, and that the Church of *England* hath such a Ministry, and vain to expect that men should pay them any more respect than I owed my Master that never preacht but once, and that drunken; (and divers very like him.) Or that they should use this as an argument to draw men to hear them.

XXXII. If the King or Law should settle a Physician of his (or a Patrons) choice in every Parish, it were well done if it be but to have help at hand for Volunteers: But if he command all to use them and to use no other before them or against them, where unskilful or untrusty men are placed, no man is bound to obey this command: No mens Law can dissolve the Law of Nature, nor disoblige a man from a due care of his Life, nor bind him to cast it away upon Obedience to ignorant or bad and treacherous Men. And a mans Soul is more precious than his Health or Life; and he is bound to greater care of it; and is no more to trust it on the will of his Superiours. How vast is the difference between an ignorant rash Physician or Pastor, and one that is wise, experienced and trusty? They that scorn Men for going for greater edification from one to another, do not so if a man prefer a skilful Physician to one that kills more than he cures; or a skilful and careful Tutor for his Son, yea or a Farrier for his Horse.

XXXIII. If one Preacher be not for Edification to be greatly preferred before another, then *One Book* is not: And so it's no matter what Book they read or value; and what a Student will this make? And what a Trade for the Booksellers? And why then should their own Books be so valued? And why then do they silence hundreds or thousands and forbid them to preach on pain of ruine, (tho no false Doctrine be proved against them) if they think not that the difference is very great.

XXXIV. When

XXXIV. When Councils hereticated and condemned Thousands or Hundreds of Priests and Bishops, whom Christian Emperours and Princes owned as Orthodox, they did not then think every Patron, Prince or Prelate a competent Judge with what Pastor Men should trust the conduct of their Souls: Nor did they think so that forbade men hearing fornicators; Nor *Cyprian* that required the People to forsake *Basilides* and *Martial* (*& Peccatorem Propositum.*)

XXXV. So full was the proof given in the Book called, *The first Plea for Peace*, that the Church from the beginning denied Princes and Magistrates to be entrusted with the choice of Bishops, or Pastors to whom the Churches were bound to trust the conduct of their Souls, that he who denyeth it, is not worthy to be therein disputed with. And yet we doubt not but they may force Infidel Subjects and Catechumens to hear sound and settled Preachers and Catechists; And may dispose of the Tythes, Temples and many other Accidents of the Church; and may drive on Pastors and People to their Duty.

XXXVI. It is false Doctrine that *two distinct Churches* may not be in the same Precincts or City; This being a meer Accident which abundance of Cases make unnecessary and unlawful: Which I shall prove.

That which is no where commanded by God, is no duty: But that there shall be but one Church (or Bishop) in the same Precincts, is not commanded of God, *Ergo*, &c. (Divine of Gods making.)

They own the Major in the case of *Indifferent* thing. If they deny the Minor let the affirmers prove any such command. We grant a command of Love and Concord; and a prohibition of all that is against them. But in many instances, to have several Churches in the same precincts, is not against them.

If they fly to the Canons of foreign Councils, the reason of them we shall weigh and duely regard; But they were National, and had their Legislative Power only from their own Princes and their Counselling Power only from Christ: And we disown all foreign Jurisdiction.

XXXVII. In all these Cases following (and more) two Churches may be in the same precincts (yea and a City.)

1. In Case that several Bishops are called justly to dwell in the same City, or Diocess, and many of their Flock be with them, *e. g.* Many Bishops of *England* dwell long, yea mostly in *London* or in *London* Diocess: *e. g.* The Bishop of *Eli* dwells in the Parish of *St. Andrews Holbourn*: *Q<sup>n</sup>*. Whether there he be a Subject to *Dr. Stillingfleet* as his Pastor, and bound to obey him? or whether many out of his Diocess (thousands) may not as Lawfully dwell half the Year in *London* as he? And whether when he preacheth to them, he do it not as their Bishop (in *London* Diocess.) And so of many other Bishops that here reside.

XXXVIII. 2. Either our Parish Churches are true Churches, or not. If not,

not, the Separatists are so far in the right ; And separate not from true Churches *eo nomine* because they separate from them. If yea, then many Churches are in the same City and Diocefs. ( Of their agreement and dependance on the same Bishop I shall speak anon. )

XXXIX. 3. In case that in one City there be resident Stranges, that are sent on Embassies, or live for Merchandize, or flee from Miseries, and are the Subject of other Princes, whose Laws and Customs they are under, *e.g.* At *Frankford, Hamburgh, Middleburgh, Dantzick, Constantinople*, there have been English distinct lawful Churches: And in *London* there are *Dutch* and *French* Churches: And if the King allowed a *Swedish* Church, a *Danish* Church, a *Saxon* Church, &c. with their several Bishops, who is so weak as to need proof that this is lawful, and they true Churches?

XL. 4. In case men of different Language are not capable of mutual converse by personal communion or help: As *Dutch, French, Italian, Greeks, Germans, &c.* *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond* ( oft in *Dissert.* and *Annot.* ) do maintain that *Peter* at *Rome* had a Church of *Jews*, and *Paul* a Church of *Gentiles*: And that the like distribution of Churches of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, there was at *Antioch, Alexandria* and other places: And by this they Salve the Contradictions in Church History about the Succession of *Linus, Cletus* and *Clemens*: And the Apostles settled not a sinful Church way.

XLI. 5. Yea *Grotius* maintaineth that the Apostles settled the Churches at first not like the Jewish Priesthood, but in the order of their Synagogues; ( *de Imper. sum. Patest.* and in *Annot.* ) And that as there were divers Synagogues in a great City with their *Archisynagogus* and Elders, so there were divers Churches in a City with Bishops and Presbyters.

XLII. 6. When there are a greater number of Persons in one City or precinct than can have any just personal Knowledge and Communion, and more than any one Bishop with his Presbytery can perform the needful Pastoral oversight to, it is lawful and a duty, to gather another Church in that City or Precinct: But this is truly the Case of many great Cities, though worldly Wisdom have at *Rome*, and other places oft denied notorious evidence and experience. He that will gather up all the duties that *Dr. Hammond* saith were charged on the Bishops ( in his Annotations on all the Texts that name Elders and Bishops ) if he can believe that any Bishop can perform the tenth part of them to all in the Diocefs of *London, York, Lincoln, Norwich, &c.* I will not dispute against him if he maintain a Bishops Ubiquity, or that at once he can be in twenty places. But if they say, that what then was commanded them to do personally, they may do by others, I say, that if they may change the *Work*, they may change the *Power*, that specifieth the Office; and so it is not the same Office in *specie* instituted in Scripture: And then Lay-men may have Power to preach and administer Sacraments, and do the Office of Priests, and yet be no Priest ( as Civilians do of Bishops ) which is a Contradiction. Certainly if there be more Scholars in the City than

than one Master can Teach and Rule, it is no Schism to set up more Schools and Schoolmasters, but a duty. And if the Lord Mayor on pretence of City Government should put down but as great a part of Family Government, as those Diocesans do of Parochial Church Government, who allow none under them to be truly *Episcopi Gregis*, and have the power of their Church Keyes, I think that it were no Schism to restore Families so that the City might have more than one (entirely.)

XLIII. 7. If the Sovereign Power upon Politick or Religious Reasons should determine, that *e. g.* Dr. A, and Dr. B, and Dr. C. shall all be Bishops in London, to such Volunteers of Clergy and Laity as shall choose each of them to be their Bishop, and this without altering their dwellings, no man can prove it sinful; And of his reasons the King is judge.

XLIV. 8. If the Bishop or Clergy of a City, Diocese or Nation, do agree by Law or Canon to admit none to the Ministry or Communion that will not commit a known sin deliberately as the Condition of his Communion, it is a duty to congregate under other Pastors in those precincts. This is confess: If they should not only hold any error, or practise sin, but require men to subscribe and approve it, and say it is no sin, no man ought to do this; nor yet to live like an Atheist, and forsake all Worship because men forbid him, if it were but to subscribe one untruth: But alas, this is no rare Case: In one Emperours Reign all were Anathematized that subscribed not to the Council of *Chalcedon*, and quickly after all that did, or that would not renounce it: The same division and changes were made by the Councils against and for the Monothelites, *de tribus Capitulis*, Images, &c. And when all Men living have many Errours, and the Church of England disclaimeth her Infallibility, and yet will receive no Minister that will not subscribe that there is nothing in her Books contrary to the word of God, the Case is hard. But when all the things mentioned in the *Plea for Peace* are proved lawful, we shall be more yielding in this Case.

XLV. 9. If true and sound Christians mistakingly think one or many things to be heinous sins, (as Perjury, Lying, Renouncing Obedience to God, and Repentance, &c.) which are things indifferent, but of so great difficulty that most Learned and Godly and Willing Men cannot discern the Lawfulness and agree, and yet are not necessary nor just conditions of Ministry or Communion, and so it is the Imposer that entangleth them by difficulty in their dissent, it is not lawful for these men therefore to forbear all Church Worship, but must use it as they can.

XLVI. 10. If any Church unjustly excommunicate such men; or others, they must not forbear all Church order and worship because men so excommunicate them. No man must Sin to escape Excommunication; and every man in the World is a sinner; And therefore all the World must be excommunicated, if all Sinners must be so. As I before said, the times oft were when almost all the Bishops in the Empire were excommunicated by one another :



ther: Councils and Popes have oft excommunicated some for trifles and some for Truth and Duty. And such must not therefore renounce all Church Worship and Communion.

The Church of *England* do by their standing Law *ipso facto* excommunicate all (as aforesaid) that affirm any thing to be repugnant to Gods Word or sinful, in their whole Church Government, Articles, Liturgy and Ceremonies, and so to stand till they Publickly revoke this as a wicked Errour. Now many Lords and Commoners in Parliaments, have spoken against some of these particulars; and some out of Parliament: Many Ministers have done the like when the King Commissioned them to treat for Alterations; And many when the Accusations or demands of others have called them to give a Reason of their Actions. Some have maintained that it is repugnant to Gods word that Lay Civilians should have the decretive Power of the Keyes, and that the Parish Minister must cast out of Communion all that the Lay Doctors or Chancellors excommunicate, and all that dare not receive kneeling, and that they should deny Christendom to all that scruple the English sort of God-Fathers Covenants, and the transient Symbolical Image of the Cross, with abundance such things: Now all these are *ipso facto* excommunicate. And tho they be not bound to avoid the Church till this be applicatorily declared, yet *actually* excommunicate they are, and that by a higher authority than the Bishops; and they know the Churches decree; and the Priests are sworn to Canonical Obedience; And he that will not tempt them to be forsworn, nor come into a Church that hath excommunicated him, seems therein excusable: But must he therefore renounce the Church of God?

XLVII. 11. If the People are so set against one Bishop for another, as that half being for one and half for the other, and both Orthodox, they cannot be perswaded to unite in one. A Council at *Rome* determined in the Case of *Paulinus* and *Flavian* at *Antioch*, that both of them should hold their distinct Churches, and so live in love and peace. And though one or both parties in this were mistaken Sinners, so are all morral men, who yet must not live like Atheists.

XLVIII. 12. An undetermined accident must be so determined as most serveth to do the greatest good and avoid the greatest Evil: But whether divers Churches shall promiscuously live in the same City or Diocese or Parish, is an Accident not determined by God, and either way may be for the greatest good, as circumstances vary. *e. g.* When in a Church half cannot consent to condemn the words of *Theodores*, *Theodore Mopsuest*, and *Ibas*, and half will condemn them with the Council; if these can serve God quietly in Love and Peace in different Congregations, but cannot endure one another in the same, it is most for the Churches Peace that they be permitted to joyn with those of their own Mind.

When one Pope declared that it's sound Doctrine to say [ *One of the Trinity was Crucified*, ] when another had declared that it is *not* sound Doctrine, they

they that held with one Pope, and they that held with the other might both be true Churches in different Assemblies : When *Justinian* raised the bloody controverſie between the *Corrupticola* and the *Phantaſiaſta*, wiſe men thought both ſides were true Churches: Yea and ſo did many wiſe men think of the Orthodox and *Neftorians* and many *Euryebians*.

XLIX. 13. It's a common caſe under Turks and Heathens, that they give liberty of Conſcience for Chriſtians of all parties : Now ſuppoſe that in *Aleppo*, in *Conſtantinople* or elſewhere, there be ( partly for Countrey ſake, and partly for Language, but moſt for different Judgments ) one Church of *Armenians*, one of *Greeks*, one of *Engliſh-men*, &c. what Law of God makes only one of theſe to be a true Church, and which is it ?

L. 14. Suppoſe that the ſetled Church e. g. in *Holland*, *Sweden*, *Saxony*, is for Preſbytery, or for an Epiſcopacy that aroſe from Preſbyters ordination, or that had none or a ſhort Liturgy, and the Prince would tolerate Engliſh men ( as *Frankford* did ) to ſet up a Church of the Engliſh Form and Liturgy, I think few Prelatiſts would deny it to be lawful.

LI. I omit other inſtances, and come to the matter of *Separation*, which word ſerveth this man and ſuch other in ſo general and undiſtinguiſhed a ſenſe, as would make one think he were of Mr. *Dodwell's* mind, *Thar words in diſpute have but one ſignification, which all are bound to know that uſe them.* Even a Bell by the ſame ſound ſometime ſignifieth a call to Church, and ſometime a Funeral, and ſometime Joy ; but [ *Separate, Separate* ] is rung over and over with theſe men, as if it ſignified but one thing.

I. He that heareth half the Sermon and Service, and goeth out of Church, doth *Separate* at that time from the reſt.

When a Proteſtant Heretick was doing Penitence with his Faggot at *St. Maries* in *Oxford*, and the Fryer was Preaching, a miſtaken Voice in the ſtreet made them think the Hereticks had ſet the Church on fire, and they ſeparated from the Preacher, one Fryer ſtuck by the belly that was going out at the window ; the door being wedged with the crowd, a Boy that ſaw it open above their heads, got up on their ſhoulders, and went on 'till he ſlipt into a Monks Cowl, and there lay ſtill 'till the Monk was got out, and felt ſomething on his back, and thinking it was an heretical Devil, began to conjure him in the Name of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, to tell him what he was, and the Boy cryed, *O good Maſter I am the Bakers boy*, &c. Quære, Whether this was *Schiſmaricks* ſeparation.

At *Walfall* in *Stafford-ſhire*, Mr. *Lapthorne* ( known to me in his luſty age ) who had been a Non-conformiſt, but thought it an honour to be converted by a King, and gloried that King *James* in conference changed him ; but being as ruſtick a thunderer as Father *Latimer* and more, he was wont to let fly without much fear ; one Mr. *Martin* in the Pariſh accounted the greateſt enemy to Puritans, when he heard what he liked not, would goe out of Church ; one day ( in a path way where Mr. *Lane* had rode a little before )  
pelt-

pelting Crabs with a pole, the ground opened and swallowed him and his pole, that they could never be found (being a Cole-mine long on fire:) ever after that, when any one would goe out of Church at a blustering passage, Mr. *Laphorne* would call to him, *Remember Martin*; Quere, Whether all these were separating Schismatics?

But this is too far off: In *Dunstable* West, where Dr. *Sherlock* Preacheth, when I was licensed twenty years ago, at *Christmas*, as I was Preaching, some Lime or Stone fell down in the Steeple with the crowd, the Church being old and under suspicion, they all thought it was falling, and most ran out in tumult, and some cast themselves headlong from the Gallery for hast; when they were quieted and came in again, the Boyes in the Chancel broke a Wainscot Skreen with climbing on it, and the noise made them run out again; one old woman going out, cryed, It's just with God because I took not the first warning, Lord forgive me, and I'll never come again: Quere, Whether these; or at least this resolving Woman was a Schismatick, and separated from the Catholick Church?

If not, there is some separation that is not so bad as Murder; and methinks the Doctor should forgive it for the success; for the Parish hereupon resolved to pull down the Church and build it new, a far better Fabrick where the Dr. now Preacheth; and it drove me away that I preacht there no more; Whether this new Church built where the old one had possession before, be not a Schismatical Separatist, I leave to him.

LII. 2. *Local Separation* without *Mental* can make no culpable Schism; for *Nisi Voluntarium est morale*; if a man be imprisoned or be sick and cannot come to the Church, it is innocent Separation; I have been at no Church this half year, much against my will, O that God would heal me of this Separation!

LIII. 3. If it must be *mental Separation* that must be culpable, then it is diversified according to the mental degree and kind; and no man separateth from the universal Church who separateth not from somewhat *essential* to it; to separate from its *Integrals* or *Accidents* may be culpable, but it's no *Separation from the Church*, no more than every breach of the Law is a Separation from the Kingdom.

LIV. 4. Some separate as to place, locally and not mentally, some mentally and not locally, and some both: He that daily observeth the outward Communion of the Church, and yet taketh it for no Church, or denyeth its Faith, Hope or essential Duty, separateth indeed. All those men that live unbelievably, atheistically, wickedly, that in their converse prate against the Scripture and immortality of the Soul, and that hate and persecute serious Godliness, are damnably separated from Christ, and therefore from the Catholick Church, and are so to be esteemed so far as this is known, tho' when it is unknown, the Church can take no notice of it.

LV. 5. It being only *Humane Laws* and *Circumstantial Conveniences* that  
F make

make it unmeet to have divers Churches and Bishops living promiscuously in the same Parishes, Cities, Dioceses or Nations; where Laws and circumstances allow it, it is no unlawful separation.

LVI. 6. He that liveth in forreign Lands (Christian, Mahometan or Heathen) where various Churches live promiscuously (*Greeks, Armenians, Protestants, Papists, &c.*) is no Schismatick, if he choose which he thinks best, and be absent locally from the rest, condemning them no further than they deserve.

LVII. 7. He that removeth into another Diocese or Parish for his worldly interest, separateth without fault from the Church he was in.

LVIII. 8. It is a lawful separation to remove ones dwelling, because the Minister is ignorant, unskilful, or otherwise bad, and this for the better edification of his Soul, and the use and help of a more able faithful Minister, even Law and Custome and reason do allow it.

LIX. 9. Tho the Canon 57. and 28. forbid Ministers oft to give the Sacrament to Strangers that come out of other Parishes, even where no Preaching is, yet those many sober People that use this in *London*, are not taken to be Schismaticks, as bad as Murderers: Many that are esteemed the most sober religious Conformists do ordinarily goe from their own Parish Churches, some (in *Martins* and *St. Giles's* Parish, &c.) for want of room, and some for more Edification, to *Dr. Tillotson*, *Dr. Stillingfleet*, *Dr. Burnet*, *Dr. Fowler*, *Mr. Gifford*, *Mr. Durham*, *Mr. Horneck* and such others, and communicate with them; and tho these are called by the late Catholics by the Name of *Dangerous Trimmers*, I think even *Dr. Sherlock* will think it more pardonable than *Murder*, if they come to him.

LX. 10. If the King and Law should restore the antient order that every City, that is, every great incorporate Town in *England* should have a Bishop, (yea or every great Parish) and that the Diocesans should be their Arch-Bishops, and our new Catholics should tell the King and Parliament that they are hereby unchristened Schismaticks, as dangerous as Adulterers or Murderers, for gathering Churches within a Church, I would not believe them.

LXI. 11. If (*e.g.* at *Frankford*, *Zurick*, *Lubeck*, *Hamburg*, &c.) a Church is settled in the *Lutheran* way, and another in the *Bohemian* way, described by *Lasius* and *Commenius*, (which is a conjunction of Episcopacy, Presbytery and Independency) or a Church that had no Liturgy, or none but that which the French Protestants and Dutch have, would it be damning Schism, for such as *Cox* and *Horne* at *Frankford* to set up an Episcopal Church in the English mode, and with their Liturgy, and so far to separate from the rest?

LXII. 12. If it be true that *John Maier*, *Fordon*, and others say that Presbytery was the Government of the Church of *Scotland* before Episcopacy was brought in, was the introduction of Episcopacy by *Palladius* a damning Schism.



Schism by separating from the former, or a Reformation; is just Reformation Schism?

LXIII. 13. When the Church first set up Patriarchs, Metropolitans, General Councils, Monasteries, Parish Churches distinct from Cathedrals, Organs, New Liturgies, and multitudes of Ceremonies, this was a departing or separating from the contrary Church way which was there before, was it therefore Schism?

LXIV. 14. When *Socrates* tells us of some Countreys that had Bishops in the Countrey Villages (like our Parishes) was it a damning Schism to separate from this custome, by decreeing that even small Cities should have no Bishops, *Ne vilescat nomen Episcopi*? or when the *Chorepiscopi* were put down, where they had been?

LXV. 15. If a man separate not from any thing essential to the Church of *England*, he separateth not from that Church, though he refuse that which is its Accidents, or some Integral parts: We are charg'd with separating from the Church of *England*, as if it were a matter of fact beyond dispute, and scorn'd for denying it, even by them that will not tell us what they mean by the Church of *England*, or by *Separation*. By the Church of *England* we mean the *Christian Kingdom of England*, or all the Christians in *England*, as living in one land, under one Christian King who Governeth them by the Sword, which includeth their Concord among themselves in true Christianity; we are Christians, we profess agreement in Christianity with all Christians, we are under the same King as they are, and profess subjection, and take; the same Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy; yea, we are not charged with differing in any thing called Doctrinal from their Thirty Nine Articles; but we disown certain late Covenants and Oaths which are not Twenty three Years old, and the Subscription to one Canon about the Innocency of all in their Liturgy; now either these new Oaths, Covenants and Canon, Liturgy and Ceremonies are essential to the Church of *England*, or not; If yea, then, 1. It's a poor humane Church, made by them that made these Oaths, Liturgy and Ceremonies. 2. And then it's a new upstart Church, and no man can answer the Papiists where it was before *Luther*, or before *Henry 8.* yea, if its essentials were made by this King and Parliament, 1662. then the present Church is no older: But if these things be *indifferent*, or *not essential* to the Church, then to separate only from these, is not to separate from the Church.

If it be said, *That for the sake of these we separate from the Church is self, and therefore from its essence*; we abhor the accusation, and challenge them to prove it: If we separate from the Church essentially, it is either *Locally* or *Mentally*; not *Locally*, for we are yet in *England*, nor is *Local distance* only a sin; not *Mentally*, for we own it for a true Christian Kingdom, called a *National Church*, bound to serve Christ in Love and Concord to their Power: We deny not the King to be the Governour, nor Christians to be Christians, no

nor the particular Churches and Ministers to be true (tho culpable) Church-  
es and Ministers, nor their Sacraments to be true Sacraments; we profess to  
hold with them one Catholick Body, one Spirit, one God, one Christ, one  
Faith, one Baptism ( in the essentials ) and one Hope, and are ready to pro-  
mise to live in Concord with them in all other things, as far as will stand  
with our Obedience to God; so that we separate not from the Church of  
England as such, but from some of its *Accidens*, which we dare not be guilty  
of.

LXVI. 16. The same I say of a *Parish Church*; he that locally removeth,  
e. g. from a Church that hath *Organs*, to one that hath none, separateth from  
a pair of Organs, but not *Mentally* from the Church, unless the Organs be  
its essence.

LXVII. 17. They that are for the true antient Episcopacy, ( e. g. as much  
as Arch-Bishop *Usher's* Reduction which we offer'd did contain ) but dislike  
the Lay Civilians power of the Keyes, and Officials, Surrogates, Arch-deacons  
Government, &c. do not separate from the Church as Episcopall, but from  
the humane Noveltyes which they disown.

LXVIII. 18. If a Parishioner fall out with his Priest, and they goe to Law  
about Tythes, Glebes, Words, &c. and the Suit be long, and the man dare  
not Communicate with him believing that he hateth him, tho the animosity  
should be culpable, being but personal, his going from him to another Church  
is not separating from Christ; ( for I hope that even Mr. *Dodwell* himself will  
not say that every Priest is Christ. )

LXIX. 19. *Ex quovis ligno non fit Mercurius*, surely there is some qualifica-  
tion essential to the Ministry; if a man want that qualification, it is a Duty  
to separate from him as no Minister, e. g. When I came to *Kedermister*, (af-  
ter my subjection to six or seven worke) I found the Vicar, one reputed ig-  
norant of the Fundamentals, ( he was brought in by Sir *Henry Blunt* a Papist )  
who Preacht but once a quarter, which most thought he might better have  
forborn, and his Curate Mr. *Turner* at *Milton* Preacht once a day, whom I  
found ignorant of the Catechism Principles by Conference, and he confest he  
had but one Book, *Musculus commun places in English*, and he said some of  
that to the People, and they took it for a Sermon; he lived by unlawful  
Marrying, infamous for Drinking and Quarrelling; he that had taken these  
for no Ministers, and separated from them, had not thereby separated from  
Christ or his Church Catholick.

LXX. 20. If it prove as hard to know who is the true Pastor in a compe-  
tition of Pretenders, as it was to know which was the true Pope, when there  
were two or three, ( above twenty times ) or whether, e. g. *Optandus* was  
true Bishop of *Geneva* that knew not Letters, or whether Duke *Heriberts* Son  
consecrated in Infancy was Arch-Bishop of *Rhemes*, or any other Infant con-  
secrated be a Bishop, ( officiating *per alios*, Surrogates, Chancellours, Offi-  
als, &c. ) it is not here a Separation from Christ to separate from either of  
the.

the Pretenders: He that mistaketh not, is not liable to the Charge, he that mistakes, doth not erre in an Article of Faith, but in a difficult point of humane title, and the qualification and right of a single man; and my Opinion is, that if such a title were tryed before our Judges or King, and they should mistake and give Judgment against him that had right, this were no separating from Christ, nor proof that they are Infidels.

LXXI. 21 If the Case of two contending Bishops or Presbyters come before a General or Provincial Council, and they mistake and give it to the wrong, and so separate from the right, I do not think that thereby they separate from Christ or the Church Catholick, *e. g.* The Constantinopolitan Council first gave the Church of *Constantinople* to *Nazianzene*, and after judged him out as having no right; if by this they separated from Christ, they that take them for the Catholick Church representative, must say that the Catholick Church separated from Christ and it self.

When another Council wrongfully deposed *Chrysostome*, and separated from him, and *Cyril Alexandr.* perswaded the continuance of it, did the universal Church separate from it self and Christ? If a General Council which should be wisest, be excusable from damning Schism, whenever it misjudgeth and separateth from a rightful Bishop, sure every Lay-man and woman that doth the same, doth not separate from Christ.

If it prove that a General Council deposed *Nestorius* as unjustly as *David Derodon* thought, or *Dioscorus* as unjustly as others thought, or *Flavian* as unjustly as the Orthodox think, this proveth them Guilty of some Schism, but not of separating from the universal Church.

When *Menna* of *Constantinople*, and the Pope excommunicated each other, when a Synod in *Italy* renounced *Vigilius*, and all his Successors were an hundred years deposed from their Primacy, and a Patriarch at *Aquileia* set up in his stead for a great part of *Italy*, because *Vigilius* subscribed to a General Council, *de tribus Capitulis*, this was Schism (somewhere) but not separating from Christ.

LXXII. 22. If a man in *England* should think that all the old Councils were obligatory, which decree that he shall be taken for no Bishop that comes in by the choice (yea or Mediation) of Courtiers, Princes or great men, or any that have not the true Consent of Clergy and People, and thereupon should conclude that Bishops, Deans, Prebends, &c. so chosen and imposed are Lay-men and no true Bishops and Pastors, this were a separating from those Persons, but not from Christ and the Universal Church, when as Mr. *Thorndike* saith, that till the right of Electing Bishops by the Clergy and People be restored, we need look no further for the reason of the Contempt of Episcopacy here.

So if a man think that God never trusted every Ignorant Wicked man that can but get Money and buy an Advowson, to choose those Pastors to whose conduct all the People are bound to trust their Souls, (and the Bishop to ad-

mit them for fear of a *Quare impedit*, if they have but a Certificate and can speak Latine ) This is not damning Separation.

LXXIII. 23. If a Bishop set up a seeming Convert, really a Papist ( *e. g.* Mr. *Hutchinson* alias *Berry*, or one of them that lately Confessed themselves Papists, ) the People that find by experience what the man is, are not damned Schismaticks for not taking him for their Pastor, or for going from him.

If *Godfrey Goodman* Bishop of *Gloucester* was a Papist, did he separate from Christ that separated from the Diocesan Church of *Gloucester*, while he was an Essential part ? Or that did not implicitly trust all the Priests that he ordained ?

LXXIV. 24. If in a Cathedral Church one withdraw from their Service, because of their difference in singing, Ceremonies, &c. from the Parish Churches, tho it be the Bishops Church that he separateth from, it is not as a Church, nor from any thing essential to it, *e. g.* *Miles Smyth* Bishop of *Gloucester* ( the famous *Hebrician*, and chief in our Bibles Translation ) declared and performed it, that he would never come more to his Cathedral, because the Dean ( in *Lauds* time ) kept up the Altar. *Qu.* Whether he separated from himself or his Church ? *Ubi Episcopus ibi Ecclesia*: Who were the Separatists ? They that followed the Bishop, or they that separated from him and kept to the Cathedral ? The same I say of *Williams* Bishop of *Lincoln* that wrote against Altars.

LXXV. 25. If faithful Pastors and People are settled in concord, and the higher Powers make a Law to depose and eject them without just cause ( as Multitudes were in many Emperours dayes, and Multitudes by the *Interim* in *Germany* in *Charles* the fifts time ; and Multitudes in the Palatinate by *Ludovicus*, and in too many other Countreys ) those that leave the Temples and Tythes to the Magistrate, but cleave to their old Pastors in forbidden meetings ( called Conventicles ) supposing the Pastoral Relation not dissolved ( as the *Joannites* clave to *Chrysostom* ) do not thereby separate from the Catholick Church: Had the Power been lawful that set up another way, when Dr. *Gunning* kept up his Meetings at *Exeter* House, it had not been a Separation from Christ that he then made.

LXXVI. 26. If the Law command all to take one man for his Pastor, and a Parent command his Child, or a Husband his Wife to take another and not that, and the Child or Wife know not which should be obeyed, and whether the choice belong more to the Domestick, or the Publick Government, it is not a separating from Christ, which way ever such an one shall go.

LXXVII. 27. Yea if I should think that self-Interest and self-Government bind me rather to choose a Pastor for my self, than to stand to such a choice by Prince, Patron or Prelate, which I think intolerable, as well as ( against their will ) I may choose a Wife, or a Physician, or a Tutor, or a Book, or



my daily food, this is not separating from the Universal Church.

LXXVIII. 28. If owning the same Diocesan make them of one Church who differ more than Nonconformists and Conformists do, then owning the same Christ, Faith, Scripture, &c. maketh them of one Catholick Church who differ less. But, &c. *Jesuites, Dominicans, Jansenists*, and all the Sects of Papists are taken for one Church, because they own the Pope and Councils. In *England* the Diocesan Conformists are taken for one Church, tho' some of them are as much for a Foreign Jurisdiction, as Arch-bishop *Laud*, Arch-bishop *Bromhall*, Bishop *Gummings* Chaplain, Dr. *Saymell*, Mr. *Thorndike*, Dr. *Heylin*, and many more, have manifested in their words and writings. And some that subscribe the Articles of General Councils erring in Faith and against Heathens Salvation, and against free will, and for Justification by Faith only, &c. do shew that they differ in the Doctrines of Religion, (unless the sound or syllables be its Religion) while one and another take the words in contrary senses. Some are for Diocesans being a distinct Order from Presbyters, some (as *Usher* and many such) deny it: Some hold them to be of Divine Right, and some but of humane; some think the King must choose them, some rather the Clergy and People; some hold them Independent, others rather subject to the Arch-bishops and Convocation; some think all that bear Office in their Church Government are lawful, others think Lay-Civilians Government by the Keyes unlawful (and so are *ipso facto excommunicate* by their own Canons;) some that promise Canonical Obedience to their Ordinary, take the Judges of the Ecclesiastical Courts for their Ordinaries; and others only the Bishops; some think they are sworn to obey their Ordinaries, if they rule according to the Canons (and so to pronounce all Excommunicate: that the Canon excommunicates, if commanded;) Others think otherwise, that they are judges themselves whether the Canons command *licita & honesta*; some take the Pope to be Antichrist, and the Church of *Rome* no true Church; others think otherwise. Many more (*Arminian* and other) such differences there are, and yet all of one Church, both Catholick, National, Diocesan and Parochial (oft:) Much more are those Nonconformists that differ from the Church in nothing but what the Imposters call Indifferent.

LXXIX. 29. If one that prayeth in the Litany against false Doctrine and Schism, and readeth the Conformists telling him of the danger of it, should verily think that Dr. S. printeth and preacheth false Doctrine, and such as plainly tendeth to serve Satan against Christian Love and Peace, and to the most Schismatical dividing and damning of Christians, should hereupon separate from him for fear of Schism and false Doctrine, and go to a safer Pastor, I think it were not to separate from Christ.

LXXX. 30. If a Bishop in any Diocese in *London* should openly write or plead for a Foreign Jurisdiction, and we are told that none are true Ministers,

sters that depend not obediently on the Bishop, he that for fear of the Law, or of Personal or common perjury, should separate from that Bishop and his numerical Dioceſan Church, doth thereby neither separate from the Catholick Church, nor from the Church of *England*. As if the Kings Army should have a Colonel that declared himself an obliged Subject to the King of *France* and bound to obey him, the Regiment may forsake that Colonel. Yea if the General of the Kings Army should give up himself in subjection to the Enemy or a Foreign Power, and say, *I will take a Commission from the Turk*, and my Officers shall only obey me, and the Soldiers obey them, were not this an Army of Traytors or Rebels, though none but the General took a Commission from the Enemy? So if the Bishops should all take Commissions from the Pope, or declare themselves Subjects to a Foreign Jurisdiction, it were no separating from Christ, to separate from them all, in Loyalty to Christ, and to avoid National perjury and Schism.

LXXXI. 31. If a man think that he is bound to use all Christs instituted means of Salvation, and live in a Church that wilfully omitteth any one of them, *e. g.* either Infant baptism, or singing Psalms, or Praying, or Preaching, or the Lords Supper, or all Personal care, and discipline to exclude the grossly intolerable, to resolve the doubting, &c. He that in Obedience to Christ goeth to a Church and Pastor (in the same Dioceſs or City) that omitteth none of these, is no damned Schismatick.

LXXXII. 32. He that is unjustly cast out of the Church, and by its very Laws excommunicated *ipso facto*, is no damned or Sinful Schismatick for Worshipping God in a Church that will receive him: Nor any one that is denyed Communion unless he will sin; Much more if they should prove half as many and great Sins as the Nonconformists have said they fear (in the first Plea for Peace, &c.)

LXXXIII. 33. If a Foreigner that doth but half understand our language, withdraw to a Church and Pastor whose tongue he understands, obeying God and Nature is no damning Schism.

LXXXIV. 34. If one that is erroneously conceited of the obligation of General Councils, should think it a sin to kneel at the Sacrament on any Lords day in the year, or any Week day between *Easter* and *Whitsunrise*, because Tradition and the twentieth Canon of the first Council, and that at *Trull*, &c. do forbid then to adore kneeling, this separating on that account to another Congregation is not damning.

If it be said, that Mr. *Thorndike* and others tell us that it is not necessary that we do the same things which the Supream Catholick Power commanded, but that we subject our selves to the same Power which may change their own Laws. I answer, 1. The asserting of that Universal Sovereignty is the greatest Crime and Heresie of all. 2. By this it seems that our Religion is very mutable, and very uncertain, and a man hath need to take heed of obeying any old  
Canons,

Canons, till he know the mind of the present Church ; ( and who those be, and how to know it. ) 3. But what if the same man read Dr. *Heylin* ( of Sab. ) telling him that this custome against *Adoration-kneeling* continued a thousand years, and was never revok't by any true General Council, but changed by little and little by mens practice : And what if he question who those Changers were, and whether their practice was Rebellion at first, and whether they had power to repeal the Canons of the greatest Councils without a Council. Sure they that are for such Councils universal soveraignty, when they have cast men into these snares, should scarce tell them that they are damnable Schismatics, for joyning with such Churches as obey these Councils, rather than with those that ruine men for not disobeying them.

LXXXIV. And now Reader if thou art one that thinkest of these things with Christian Sobriety and impartiality, I appeal to thee whether if I should be of the mind of Mr. *Dodwell*, and such self-conceited *Resolvers*, I should not write my own Condemnation, and be one of the grossest Schismatics that any History hath mentioned, unless ever there were any man so mad as to hold himself to be all the Church : Yea, when he no more distinguisheth of Separation and Schism, but involves almost all Christians in his Condemnation, and tells us that Schism will damn us as soon as Adultery and Murder, is it not obvious for all men to infer that we are as odious as *Adulterers* and *Murderers* ? and doth he not Preach Christians into the *hated* of each other ? and can any wonder if Rulers should think the Punishment of *Murderers* is not worse than we deserve ? It is not *Nem-gare* only, but *Tyburn* that these healing men do seem to assign us ; it would be too tedious to look over all these again, and shew you how great the number is that these men damn, and how few on Earth in any Age they excuse from being so far like Murderers.

LXXXV. 1. It seems to me that he *virtually* damneth all Christians on Earth as such Schismatics ; for it is most certain that all men have sin, and culpable imperfection in Knowledge, Will and Practice ; and if any say, *That he hath no sin, he is a Liar*, saith St. *John* ; and it is certain that all two persons on Earth have many errours, and many differences from one another ; it is certain that the Love and Duty of Christians towards each other is culpably defective in all men : It is certain that no man living is so perfect in knowledge as to know all the *indifferent* things in the world, which may be imposed, to be *Indifferent* ! And long and sad experience hath told the Church, that both gross errours and sins, and things called Truths or indifferent, which few can be sure of, may be imposed. What follows from all this, but that all men on Earth may easily fall under the imputation of disobedience to Prelates, and so be Excommunicate, and then they have their choice (when no man is perfect, and they cannot change their mindes) 1. Whether they will be damned as Excommunicate

and practical Atheists that give over all Church Worship; 2. Or as damnable Schismatics, for worshipping God in Churches when they are excommunicate; 3. Or as perfidious Lyars, that will make false Confessions, Professions and promises, to get off an Excommunication. When Mr. Dodmel numbers those with Schismatics that [*suffer themselves to be excommunicate,*] if they have no other means in their Power to hinder it, it seems these great Enemies to absolute reprobation, do think all Christians being unavoidably born to imperfection of Knowledge, are as unavoidably born to damnation whenever Prelates or Priests please thus to precipitate them.

LXXXVI. 2. Particularly, 1. The first and second Canons *ipso facto* excommunicate all that say [*that any manner of Obedience and Subjection within his Majesties Realms and Dominions is due to any usurped and foreign Power :*] By this all Papists and all pretended Protestants (such as Dr. Barrow confuteth) who hold any manner of Obedience and Subjection due to Pope or Foreign Councils, are Excommunicate.

2. Those that say that the Book of Common Prayer containeth any thing in it repugnant to the Scriptures, are *ipso facto* excommunicate. Which now by the new Laws are interpreted of the present Books.

3. In this all are excommunicate who say, the *Mis-translations* (in Psalms, Epistles or Gospels, of which many instances have been given) to be any thing repugnant in the Scripture.

4. And all that say, It is against the Scripture to deny Christendom to all Infants that have not such Vowes in their Names and for their Education as we call Godfathers, and Godmothers, tho the Parent (who is forbidden it) offer his Child by Sponson.

5. And all that say it is against Scripture to deny Christendom to all that refuse the Covenanting transient Images of a Cross.

6. And all that say that it is against Scripture for all Ministers to profess [*that it's certain by Gods Word that baptized Infants (without exception) so dying are undoubtedly saved*] when no word of God is cited that saith it, and adding to Gods word is dreadfully threatned, and when it's certain that all Ministers are not certain of any such thing (and I think no one.)

7. All are *ipso facto* excommunicate that say, It is against Gods Word to deny Church Communion in the Sacrament to all that dare not take it kneeling, for fear (tho mistaken) of breaking the second Commandment by Symbolizing with Idolaters, that are seeking to reduce the Nation to their Sin, and that live round about us.

8. All are excommunicate that say it is against Scripture to pronounce all faved that are buried, except the unbaptized, self-murderers and the excommunicate, while thousands of Sadducees, Hobbists, Infidels, Papists, Perjured, Adulterers, Drunkards, &c. dwell among us.

9. By the fifth Canon all are *ipso facto* excommunicate that say, [*Any of the Articles are in any part erroneous, or such as they (perhaps as doubters)*

may



may not with a good Conscience subscribe to, ] and consequently all the aforesaid Conformists that think the fence erroneous while they subscribe those words and shall affirm, e. g. that *Canons are made necessary to Salvation*; tho the matter cannot be proved by Scripture, contrary to Art. 6.

Those that contrary to Art. 8. say, any thing in Athanasius Creed may not be subscribed.

Such as Bishop Taylor that against Art. 9. deny *Original Sin*.

Those that say contrary to Art. 10. that the Word [ *no Power* ] excludeth *Common natural Power*, or maketh *Nature* to be *Grace*.

Those that write against our being accounted righteous, only for Christs merits, and say that another subordinate Righteousness is named many hundred times in Scripture, contrary to Art. 11.

Those that contrary to Art. 13. say, that works done before the Inspiration of the Spirit may make men meet to receive Grace.

Those that with Dr. Hammond write for works that are not commanded but counselled, and Free-will-offerings, contrary to Art. 14.

All they that take *Infants and new baptiz'd Persons* to have no sin, contrary to Art. 15.

All that say, that after we have received the H. Ghost, we cannot depart from Grace given, contrary to Art. 16.

Those that deny the Doctrine of Election, in Art. 17.

Those that say, any on Earth may be saved by diligent living according to the light of Nature, without knowing the name of Christ, contrary to Art. 18.

Those that contrary to Art. 19. reject that Description of a visible Church, which reacheth to such as our Resolver damnableth.

All that contrary to Art. 20. say, that the Church [ *may not enforce any thing to be believed for necessary to Salvation, besides the Scripture* ] even those that say, it's necessary to Salvation, by avoiding Schism to believe that all imposed Tyths, Covenants Practices, and Ceremonies are not sin.

All that contrary to Art. 21. say, that General or other Councils may be gathered without the command and wil of Princes, and deny they may erre, and things ordained by them as necessary to Salvation have neither Strength nor Authority, unless it may be declared that they are taken out of Holy Scripture.

Those that deny Art. 23. that those are lawfully called and sent into the Ministry, who have publick Authority given them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lords Vineyard, are chosen and called hereto, (for want of Canonical Succession.)

Those that contrary to Art. 24. would have Gods Worship performed to them that understand not the language, to avoid the Schism of having many Churches in a City.

Those that take Confirmation or Penance, or the other three for Sacraments of the Gospel contrary to Art 25.

Those that contrary to Art. 26. would not have it believed to be the Peoples duty, who know the Offences of Bad Ministers, to accuse them.

All that contrary to Art. 27. are against Infant Baptism, as agreeable to Christs Institution.

All that contrary to Art. 28. say, the Body of Christ is given and taken and eaten in the Sacrament otherwise than in a Spiritual manner by Faith.

All that say, that *in some wise the wicked are Parrakers of Christ in the Sacrament*, contrary to Art. 29.

All that contrary to Art. 30. say, *There is other satisfaction for Sin besides Christs Blood.*

All that say, that Men justly Excommunicate may be *reconciled and received by the multitude without open penance* (which is ordinary) contrary to Art. 33.

All that contrary to Art. 34. think that a General Council may ordain such Traditions or Ceremonies as shall in all places be one or the like: and that every Particular or National Church may not abolish those Ceremonies or Rites which the General Council or Colledge ordained.

Many things in the Book of *Homilies* [ especially against peril of Idolatry ] are blamed by many Conformists, contrary to Art. 35.

All that contrary to Art. 36. say, that the Book of Ordination wants some things necessary.

All that contrary to Art. 37. think that Pope or foreign Bishops have any Jurisdiction by right in this Land: And all that ( by mistake ) say, the King hath not chief Power in all his Dominions, meaning in *France*, of which he professeth to be King, and we so call him even in our Prayers to God.

All that say, contrary to Art. 38. that it is not their Duty *liberally to give Alms, according to their ability.*

All that contrary to Art. 39 think men in conforming may swear upon trust of their Superiours words, without judgment, and true understanding of Justice and Truth.

All these are already *ipso facto* Excommunicated by this one Canon, and if they elsewhere worship God, are called Separatists and Schismatics, in danger of Damnation, as Adulterers and Murtherers are: And how great a number are these?

10. All are *ipso facto* Excommunicate by the sixth Canon, who affirm, that the *Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, by Law established, are superstitious, or such as ( now commanded ) men who are zealously and godly affected, may not with a good Conscience APPROVE, use and subscribe as occasion requireth.* That is, all that thus mistake *kneeling* at the Sacrament, on the reasons aforementioned, to be against the second Commandment, or that judge so of the Surplice, or that think the Grosse, as described by the Canon and Liturgy, hath all the Essentials of a humane unlawful Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace. And all that are against the Rites of Godfathers that never owned the Child

Child as theirs, to be the only Sponsors in its Name, and to Vow its Christian Education (when I never knew one living that so much as made the Parents believe that he intended it :) And all that think the words of the Liturgy (making *Imposition of hands an assuring sign of Gods Gracious acceptance*.) make *Confirmation* a humane unlawful Sacrament, and say so. All these are cut off.

11. By Canon seventh all are *ipso facto* excommunicate that affirm, that the Government of the Church of England, under his Majesty, by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, and THE REST THAT BEAR OFFICE in the same, is repugnant to Gods word; that is, all Bishops, Ministers, Noblemen, Gentlemen or People, that say that it is against Gods word for Lay Civilians or Chancellours to govern by the Church Keyes, excommunicate or absolve: And all that think it unlawful for Surrogates that are not Bishops but Presbyters, either as a Cryer *pro forma* to pronounce all excommunicate or absolved who are so decreed by the Lay Chancellor, or else for them (or a Priest-Chancellour) to govern a Diocese by the Keyes of Excommunication and Absolution being no Bishops; and all that think it sinful for Archdeacons, Commissaries, Officials, &c. who are no Bishops, to exercise the same Government by the Keyes over so many Pastors or Churches, or for a Bishop to do his Office by others that are no Bishops, any more than a Priest by those that are no Priests; or for a Diocesan with his Lay Court, to Govern many score or hundred Churches under him, without any subordinate Bishop in those Churches, that is, to set up the Name and shew, and make Christs Discipline impossible: Or for Lay Chancellors or Surrogates to publish Excommunications in the Bishops Name; which he never knew of, nor tryed the cause: Or for such Chancellours to oblige all Parish Ministers to publish all their Excommunications which are agreeable to these Canons. What quality and number they are of that call any of this sinful, I pretend not to know: But they are all now excommunicate men.

12. The eight Canon *ipso facto* excommunicateth all that affirm that the form and manner of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons hath any thing repugnant to Gods Word, &c.:] That is, all those that hold Bishops and Presbyters to be the same Order (contrary to the words of that Book.) Which yet even the Church of England while Papists declared in King *Elfricks* Canons (see *Spelman*;) And all such as *Thorndike*, who say the People and Clergy should choose their Bishops; or that say the Peoples consent is necessary to the Pastoral Relation to them, and that the old Canons for this are in force.

13. The ninth Canon *ipso facto* excommunicateth the Separatists.

14. The tenth Canon excommunicateth all that affirm [that Ministers that refuse to subscribe to the Liturgy, &c. and their Adherents may truly take to themselves the Name of another Church, not established, by Law and dare publish that this their pretended Church hath long groaned under the burden of imposed grievances, by the Church of England, and the Orders and Constitutions therein by Law established.]

established.] (*Ipso facto* is not here.) This reacheth to all that confine not Gods Church in *England* to the Party that subscribe and their Adherents: If any say, that if such as *Blondel, River, Amesius*, or any other the most Learned, holy, peaceable men that dare not subscribe as aforesaid, should with any Christians worship God together, and that these are a true Church (though he judge them faulty) and that these Canons are grievances, such are to be excommunicated: (Though it be gross Schism in others to confine not only the *Purity* but the *Verity* of a Church to their own Party:) For such to feel and groan loud here is Excommunication.

15. The eleventh Canon much to the same purpose requireth the Excommunication of all that affirm that any *Subjects* in *England* may rightly challenge the Name of *true* and *lawful Churches* besides those allowed by Law, though the King should License them.

16. The twelfth Canon *ipso facto* excommunicateth all, that make *Rules and Orders* in *Causes Ecclesiastical* without the *Kings Authority*, and submit to them, e. g. All that without the *Kings* authority agree to turn the Table Altar-wise, to require People to kneel at the Rails, or to bow toward the Altar or East, or to set up Organs, &c. All these are now excommunicate by an Authority above the Bishops, which no Bishop or Priest can dispense with (but only forbear to publish and execute it, but not nullifie it) nor nor absolve any that publicly repent not of it as a wicked Error.

16. By Canon fourteenth, if any Minister shall diminish any part of the *Orders, Rites, Ceremonies, Prayers, &c.* in regard of *Preaching* or *ANY OTHER RESPECT*, or shall adde any thing in matter or form, (e. g. If he let the Parent express the dedication of his Child to God, or lay any charge on any Parent) he breaketh the Church Law, and so far separateth from it.

17. By Canon fifteenth when twenty or thirty thousand are commanded to come to a Church that cannot receive six thousand, and the Alleys and Pewes are wedg'd so that they cannot all kneel, yet all that kneel not at the Prayers, and all that say not audibly the *Confession, Lords Prayer, Creed* and *Responses*, disobey the Laws of the Church, and so far separate from it.

18. When twenty thousand Persons are commanded to come in more than can, if ten thousand of them (or any number) should come to the Church-yard or Porch, to shew that they are not presentable, but would get in if they could, the nineteenth Canon commands to drive them away.

19. The Liturgy and Canon 22. &c. bind all under the penalty of the Law to receive the Sacrament thrice every year: If a secret Infidel, Sadducee, Hobbist, Socinian, or any Heretick say, *I am not able to change my Judgment, which is inconsistent with the Sacrament*, or if one whose Conscience tells him of the guilt of Adultery, and that he is not resolved to confess and forsake it yet; or one that by Melancholy causelessly feareth unworthy receiving to damnation; I say, if any of these will avoid the charge of Schism,

Schism  
at th  
non  
be p  
grea  
20  
ting  
prese  
and  
gero  
21  
and  
ence  
22  
dren  
dren  
23  
eth  
34  
not t  
to th  
admi  
form  
Thar  
35  
Cure  
study  
preac  
their  
Artic  
Ten  
wife  
obey  
expo  
are e  
flice  
disco  
Bishop  
far a  
[no  
the C  
36  
when



Schisma, they must run upon worse, till grace recover them, which is not at their command. And yet all notorious Offenders are prohibited it Canon 26. and particularly the Perjured: And if the tenth part so many be perjured in *England* in City and Countrey, as many fear, it's a very great number that are incapable of Communion with the Church.

20. By Canon twenty seventh on pain of Suspension no Minister must wittingly administer the Communion to any but such as Kneel, or to any that refuse to be present at publick Prayers, &c. So that all that Kneel not in receiving are rejected, and if they worship God elsewhere, must be taken for Schismatics, as dangerous as adulterers or murderers.

21. The twenty eighth Canon forbids admitting strangers to Communion, and commands sending them home to their Parish Churches: It's disobedience to violate this.

22. The twenty ninth Canon forbids urging Parents to be Present when their Children are baptized, and admitting them to Answer as Godfathers for their own Children; and any Godfather to make any other Answer or speech than the prescribed.

23. The thirtieth Canon describeth the Cross as a Sacrament, as seemeth to us.

34. By the thirty sixth Canon no man must be a Minister that subscribeth not that the Book of Common Prayer and Ordination contains nothing in it contrary to the Word of God, and that he himself will use no other form in publick Prayer and administration of the Sacraments: By which all that refuse this, or that use the forms made and imposed by the Bishops on occasions of publick Fasts and Thanksgivings, seem all to be under disobedience to the Church.

35. By Canon fourty ninth no Person not Licensed as a Preacher, may in his Cure or elsewhere, expound any Scripture, or Matter or Doctrine, but onely shall study to read plainly the Homilies: So that all Ministers before Licence to preach, all School-masters, all Parents, or Masters, that do expound to their Schollars, Children or Servants, the meaning of Baptism, or of any Article of the Creed, any Petition of the Lords Prayer, any one of the Ten Commandments (to fit them for Confirmation, or Salvation) otherwise than by plain reading the Homilies or Church Catechism, doth disobey the Law of the Church: And so do all Tutors in the Universities that expound any Scripture, matter or Doctrine, to their Pupils, before they are examined or approved by the Bishop; or any Judge on the Bench or Justice that presumeth to do it to the hearers, or any Friend or Neighbour in discourse: For it is [No Person whatsoever not examined and approved by the Bishop of the Diocess.] How few in *England* separate not from the Church as far as this disobedience amounts to? If by [no Persons] be meant only [no Ministers] it's hard enough, that Ministers may not be allowed out of the Church what Lay-men are allowed.

36. All those that deny not the validity of Baptism or the Lords Supper when they are done by an unpreaching Minister, but yet think that a man utterly

utterly unable to Teach otherwise than by Reading, may not lawfully be encouraged in so high a function, (any more than a man in Physick or School-teaching that hath not necessary skill, or is utterly illiterate,) and thinks it a sin to consent to take such an Ignorant fellow for the Pastor of his Soul if he can have better; If this man, I say, go to the next Parish Church for Sacraments, he is to be suspended first and next excommunicate: Specially if he should judge that Ignorant Reader, no true Minister for want of necessary capacity.

37. Surplices, Hoods and Tippets are made the matter of Obedience, Canon fifty eighth.

38. By Canon thirty eighth no Minister must *refuse or delay* to Christen any Child (without exception) *according to the form of the Common Prayer, that's brought to Church to him on Sundaies or Holy-daies*, though the Parents be both Jewes or Heathens or Atheists or Sadducees: The Minister must be suspended that refuseth it.

39. The seventy first Canon suspendeth all *Ministers that Preach in any private house* (except to the sick or impotent in time of necessity.) By which had Paul here preached publicly and from house to house, or *Timothy in season and out of season* as dreadfully adjured, or Christ preached as he oft did, they must be suspended: And every Minister that preacheth to his Family: And no doubt, repeating his Sermon, is preaching the same again.

40. All *Ministers must be suspended and then excommunicate, that without the Bishops Licence appoint or keep any solemn Fasts publicly or in private houses, other than by Law appointed, or be wittingly present at any*: Though it were in time of Plague, or when divers of his Neighbours are sick or troubled in Conscience, or in preparation to a Sacrament, or on some great occasion in Noble-mens Houses and Chappels: He is not to be trusted to fast and pray with his own Flock or Friends, or come among them, lest being excommunicate he be a damn'd Schismatick.

The same prohibition is for *holding meetings for Sermons called Exercises*: Which Arch-Bishop Grindall was zealous to set up, (*Q. Was he then a Schismatick? or is the damning dangerous Engine made since?*)

41. By Canon seventy third *if any Ministers meet in any private house* (as many did by consent in 1660. and 1661.) *to do any thing that any way tends to impeach the Common Prayer or any part of the Government and Discipline* (e. g. to Petition King or Parliament for the least Reformation of it) he is excommunicate *ipso facto*.

42. Canon seventy fourth brings all Ministers apparel under Church Laws, for the Shape.

43. Canon seventy sixth Excommunicateth all that *voluntarily relinquish their Ministry*, and use themselves as a Lay-men. And man having free will, that is done *voluntarily*, which is done in Obedience to mens command: And yet we are ruined in the World, if we will not leave our Ministry, at their Command.

44. It's

44. It's tedious to go over all the rest: I end at the end of them. Canon 139. excommunicateth all them that affirm that the Synod is *not the true Church of England by Representation*: that is, 1. All that take it for the *Church, real and not Representative*, lest they make the *diffused Church* ( *People and all* ) to be *Chief Church-governours*, while Convocations govern but as *their Representatives*. 2. All that say, that it is only the *Bishops* and not the *Presbyters* in Convocation that are the *Governing, Canon-making Church*. 3. All that say that the *Clergy* represent not *King, Nobles, Parliaments, Laiery*, and that these are *true parts* of the *Church of England*. All these are *ipso facto* excommunicate.

45. The 140. Canon Excommunicateth them that deny the Canons obligation of absent Dissenters, which yet even many Papists deny of Councils Canons.

46. The last Canon Excommunicateth all that condemn these Canons, as taking them to be *the work of a Company of Persons that conspired against Religious Godly men*. All this huge Catalogue are here excommunicate.

47. If any part of all this be Schism, Mr. Dodyell and this man seem to teach Separation from the Church of *England*: Or if, the late silencing, hunting and ruining of two thousand Ministers were Schism, and as bad as Bishop Taylor in *Duct. Dubit.* Mr. Hales of *Eaton, Chillingworth, &c.* say of the like, then these men make all the Church of *England* to be in as damnable a State as Adulterers and Murderers. Yea they make all damnable Schismatics that hold Communion with the Church of *England*; for that is their Sentence on them that communicate with Schismatics; *viz.* that they are guilty of their Schism.

48. They unchurch and damn the Churches of *Corinth, Galatia, Laodicea, Ephesus, Smyrna, &c.* in the Apostles dayes: For the Scripture tells us of many guilty of Schism in all these, and yet the rest communicated with them; for the Scripture speaks more of *Schism in a Church*, than of *Schism or Separation from a Church*, *Rom. 16. 17. 1 Cor. 1. 10. & 3. 31. & 11. 18. Mat. 12. 25. Luke 12. 52, 53. 1 Cor. 12. 25. Jam. 3. 15, 16.* And yet no one was commanded to separate from those Churches; no not from those that had Heresies among them, such as denied the Resurrection, and taught Fornication, and eating things offered to Idols, that were drunk at the Sacrament or Love-Feasts, nor those that had Jewish Schismatics, who talkt like ours, *Act. 15. Except ye be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, ye cannot be saved.* The Churches were not all unchurcht and damn'd that communicated with such. Yea Peter was guilty of encouraging them in Schism, that would not eat with the Christian Gentiles, but he was not unchristened by this.

49. They separate from or unchurch almost all the Ancient Churches in the dayes of the most famous Emperours and Councils: For I have manifested past doubt, that they almost all did Hereticate or separate from one another. It was Schism either in *Kilic* to Excommunicate the *As-*

an Bishops, or in them to deserve it and be excommunicate. The owning or disowning several Councils, specially that of *Calcedon* and that at *Const. de tribus Capitulis*, &c. was the Schism of almost all the Imperial Churches; one part condemning the other. And if either were in the Right, it salves not the Case with them: For most of the same men that went that way call'd the Right in one Princes Reign, went contrary in the next, and so condemned each other round; especially about Images adoration.

50. Hereby they cut off that Succession of that sort of Ordination, which they say must be uninterrupted, while it came down from Churches excommunicated by one another, or make the Proof of it impossible.

51. They separate from all the *Greek Church* at this day, as guilty of Schism, both in their Succession from Schismaticall Bishops, at *Constant. Alexand. Antioch, Jerusalem*, &c. and in their excommunicating not only the Church of *Rome* for a wrong cause (the *silioque*) but other Churches, and for divers Acts of Schism.

52. They must by their Principles Separate from the *Abassines, Egyptians, Syrians*, and all the Eastern and Southern Churches that are called *Jacobines*, and *Nestorians*: For Councils and other Churches condemn them: And they condemn the Councils of *Ephesus*, and *Calcedon*, and all since: And they must separate from and condemn the Churches of *Armenia, Georgia, Circassia*, &c. because they separate from others, and are separated from.

53. Their Principles utterly unchurch the Church of *Rome*, 1. Especially because it is guilty of the greatest Schism on earth, by setting up a false Church form and head: 2. And because they Schismatically condemn and Unchurch three parts of the Church on earth, even all save their Sect: 3. And for their many other Schismatical Doctrines and Practices: 4. And as being condemned by the *Greek Protestants* and most Churches, and separated from by the Church of *England* which they own.

54. They separate in Principles from all or near all General Councils (& save the first) as having separated from other Councils and condemned them, and being again condemned by them.

55. Some of them condemn and separate from all the Protestant Churches that have Bishops, in *Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Transylvania*, &c. because they had not their Ordination Successively from Bishops but Presbyters at the Reformation: And because they have been guilty of Schism against others.

56. The Principles of Mr. *Dodwel* and his Associates condemn the Church of *England* as Schismatical, 1. Those that claim Succession from *Rome*, whose own Succession hath been oft and long interrupted, by incapacities and Schisms. 2. For holding Communion with those Protestant Churches which these men call Schismaticks.

57. They condemn and separate from all the Churches called Presbyterian in *France, Holland, Geneva, Scotland* formerly, and those in *Helvetia* that have no Bishops; Tho some would threat kindness on them by saying that



that they would have them and cannot? And why cannot they?

58. Their Principles make the Bishop of *Oxford, Bristol, &c.* Schismatics: For their Dioceses are Churches taken out of Churches, being lately parts of other Dioceses.

59. And they condemn all the Parish Churches in *England* as Churches distinct from Cathedrals: For they are all Churches gathered out of Churches: At first the Cathedrals were the only single Churches: Next Monasteries were gathered; and next our Parish Churches. And the Parish Church of *Covent-garden*, is a Church taken out of a Church.

60. Their Principles damn *St. Martin* that separated to the death from all the Bishops Synods and them that were near him (save one Man) because they perswaded *Maximus* to use the Sword against *Priscillian Gnosticks*, and brought men of strict Religion under Suspicion of Priscillianism: And sure the ruined persecuted Protestants here, are more Orthodox than the *Priscillians*. And they damn *Gildas* that told the English Clergy, that he was not *eximus Christianus*, that would call them Ministers; (Do they not disgrace the many Churches dedicated to the Memory of *St. Martin*, if he be a damned man?) I doubt they damn *Paul* and *Barnabas* for local angry separating from each other: Whatever they do by *Peter* and *Barnabas* for the Separation blamed *Gal. 2.*

61. If all are Schismatics that here conform not, all those called Conformists are such, that conform to the words in a false sense.

62. They separate from all that obey the twentieth Canon of the *Nicene Council*: And from all that obey the Councils that forbid communicating with a Fornicating Priest: And from all that obey the Councils which nullify the Episcopacy of such as are obtruded by Magistrates, or not consented to by the Clergy and People. And many more such.

Abundance more instances of their Separation, and Damnation, I might adde: In a word, I think their Principles are, as I first said, for damning and separating from all men living; for all men living are guilty of some sort and degree of Schism, that is, of Errors, Principles or Practices in which they culpably Violate that Union and Concord that should be among Christians and Churches: Every defect of Christian Love, and every sinful Error, is some degree of such a violation. All Christians differ in as great matters as things indifferent: And no man living knoweth all things Indifferent to be such: And these men distinguish not of Schism, nor will take notice of the necessary distinctions given (in the third Part of the Treatise of Church Concord,) And *solutio continens* causeth pain: nor do they at all make us understand what sort of Separation it is that they fasten on, but talk of Separation in general, as aforesaid.

LXXXVII. They seem to be themselves deceived by the Papists in exposition of *Cyprian's* words *de Unit. Eccles. Unus est Episcopus*, &c. But they themselves seem to separate from *Cyprian* as a Schismatick, and consequent-

ly from all the Church that hath profest Communion with him, and with all the Councils and Churches that joynd with him: For *Cyprian* and his Council erred by going too far from the Schism and Heresie of others, nullifying all their Baptisms, Ordinations and Communions: And for this error they declared against the Judgment of the Bishop of *Rome* and other Churches; and they were for it condemned as Schismaticks by the said Bishop: And here is a far wider Separation than we can be charged with. 2. And *Cyprians* words came from the Mind that was possess'd with these opinions, and are expressive of his Inclination. 3. Yet they are true and good, understood as he himself oft expounds them; the Bishop of *Oxford* citeth some instances, many more are obvious, in which he opposeth the Bishop of *Rome*, saying, that none of them pretendeth to be a Bishop of Bishops; and limiting every man to his own Province, and saying that they were to give account to none but God, with much the like.

But in what sence is *Episcopacie* one? 1. Undoubtedly not as numerically in the personal Subjectum Relationis: One Bishop is not another; if you should say *Paternity* is One, none believe that one mans Relation of Paternity is another. The Relation is an accident of its own Subject, as well as Quantity, Quality, &c. 2. Nor doth any man believe that many Bishops go to make up one Bishop in Naturals. 3. Nor did ever *Cyprian* hold or say that all Bishops go to make up one Politick Governing Aristocracie, as many go to make one Senate or Parliament, that hath a power of Legislation and Judgment by Vote as one *Persona politica*. He never owned such a humane Sovereignty.

But *Episcopatus unus est*, 1. In specie, all Bishops have one Office; 2. Objective: As the Catholick Church is one, whose welfare all Bishops ought to seek: 3. And so finaliter as to the remote End; and are bound to endeavour Concord. 4. And as effects, all are from one efficient institutor. As it may be said that all official Magistracy in *England* is one: 1. As from one King or *summa potestas*: 2. As described by one Law, and as Justices of one Species: 3. As all their Cities and Counties and Hundreds are but part of one Kingdom, whose welfare all are for: 4. And as they are all bound to keep as much common Concord as they can; if any mean more, they should tell us what: If any mean that all Bishops make one numerical Universal Government, they are heinous Schismaticks, and the Kingdom is Sworn against their Judgment: And these Men damn them in damning Schismaticks.

The truth is, *Cyprian de Unitate Ecclesie* (leaving out the Papists additions) is a good Book, and worthy to be read of all; and take *Cyprian's* Description of the Episcopacy of the Church which we must unite with, and the nature of that Union, and we would rejoyce in such. But if *Cyprian* had lived to see either *Arians* or *Donatists* the greater number, or any Sect after call themselves the Church because that Princes set them up, and had seen them depose *Chrysostome* and such other, doubtless he would never have pleaded

pleaded the Unity of Episcopacy for this, but have judged as he did in the Case of *Marzial* and *Basiliides*; nor did he ever plead for an universal humane Sovereignty.

LXXXVIII. If we are damned Schismatics, I can imagine no pretended manner of Separation in which our Schism consists, but first, either Local as such. 2. Or Mental, as such. 3. Or Local, caused by Mental.

If Local, as such be it: All Christians are Schismatics, for being locally separated from others, and absent from all Churches and places save one.

If *Mental Separation* be it, either all *Mental Division* is such, or but some only; if *all*, then all mortal men are Schismatics, as differing in a multitude of things from others; If it be not all, what is it? is it all difference in the *Essentials of Christianity*? we grant it; and we are charg'd with no such thing. Is it all difference in the *Integrals or Accidents*? so do *all* differ that are not perfect. Is it all *want of Love*, or all *Uncharitableness* to one another? all on earth have some degree of it; and those are likeliest to have most, that do as the Bishops did against the Priscillianists, bring godly people under reproach, on pretence of opposing Heresie; or that seek the Silencing, Imprisonment, Banishment or Ruine of men as faithful as themselves: For our parts, we profess it our great Duty, to love all men as men, all Christians as Christians, all godly men as godly, all Magistrates as Magistrates, &c. Is it for our separating *in mind* from any Principles in *specie* necessary to Communion in the Church Universal, or single Churches? let it be opened what those Principles be: We own all *Christianity*, and all *Ministry of Gods Institution*, and all his Church Ordinances: We own *Bishops over their Flocks*, let them be never so large, so they be capable of the *Work and End*, and alter not the true *species*; and we submit to any that shall by the *Word* admonish Pastors of many Churches of their *Duty*, or *Sin*, or seek their good. Nor do we refuse Obedience to any humane Officers set up by Princes, to do nothing against Christs *Laws*, nor nothing but what is in Princes power in the *Accidents circa Sacra*.

Is it because we disown any *Numerical Rulers*? we own the King and his Magistrates; we own all that we can understand to be true *Pastors*; and if we are in doubt of their *Calling*, we resist them not, unless obeying Christ before them be resistance: But our Accusers loudly profess, that Usurpers are not to be owned; and if they go on the ground, that he hath right that the Prince is for; we would know, whether that hold in *Turky*, in *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, or only in *England*, or where? If it be where Princes are *Orthodox*, do they make all the People Judges of their Princes *Orthodoxy*? And we would know, whether EVERY BISHOPS and PRIESTS right, as a true Minister, called of God, and set over us, be necessary to Salvation, to be believed or known by all the People? if it be, wo to us, that ever such men were set over us, whose right we cannot know: What abundance of things go to make

make a Bishops or Priests right known ! 1. That he hath *capable sufficiency*. 2. That he is a *just Bishop*, that's *chosen* by the *King, the Dean and Chapter obediently consenting*, & that the Clergy's and Peoples consent is unnecessary. 3. That the *Diocesan species* ( over multitudes of Churches without any subordinate Bishop ) is of Christ, or lawful. 4. That their *work*, according to the *Canon*, is lawful. 5. That all our *Patrons* have right to *chuse Pastors for all the People*. 6. That they are true *Pastors* over them that *consent not*. 7. That if they prove worse far than *Marital* and *Basitides*, and be owned by the Bishops as they were, the people may not forsake them (*plebs obsequens divinis preceptis*,) which *saith Cyprian have most power to chuse or refuse*.

Is every Christian bound on pain of Damnation to *know all these*, and then to examine and judge Bishops and Priests accordingly ? or if they mistake one or more mens Commission, do they therefore separate from the Catholick Church ? If so, what a case was the *East* in by the difference between *Chrysostome* and his Competitors ? *Phorius* and *Ignatius* and hundreds others ? and *France*, about the Archbishops of *Rhemes*, when he was put out that deposed *Ludovicus* 4. and when an Infant was put in, and oft besides ?

What if the *Alexandrians*, when *Athanasius* was banished by *Constantine* himself, were half for him, and half against him ? Or *Basil* at *Casarea* was put down, and hundreds more ; or when *Theodosius* first and second and *Martian*, and *Valentinian*, and *Zeno*, and *Anastasius* and abundance more, set up and pull'd down, and set up again against each other ? What, I say, if the People now mistooke who had the best Title ? Is this separating from the Catholick Church ? When the *Interim* cast out hundreds in *Germany* ; When *Ludovicus* cast out Multitudes in the *Palatinate*, and half the People stuck to the ejected, persecuted Pastor, and the rest to the Magistrates choice, which of them separated from the Universal Church ? Is every Priest the *Universal Church*, or an *essential* part of it ? then it dyeth when he dyeth, and Apostatizeth when he doth. How many Ages in above 23 Duplicates or Schisms, was the World uncertain which was the true Pope ? suppose, *e. g.* *Arthur Jackson*, *Edmund Calamy*, and many such were placed in their Incumbency, by the Bishops, Patrons and Parish consent, according to the Law of Christ and the Land, and by a new Act of Uniformity they be all turned out, the Flock not consenting, nor any Bishop accusing, trying or deposing them ( save in Legislation, ) and some of the Parish think this dissolveth not their Relation to him, and they cleave to him as before, without any change save of Place and Tythes, and others forsake such a one, and follow the Magistrates choice, may not both these be still of the Catholick Church ? If not, I know where the old Canons laid the charge and danger. It's wonderful selfishness in those men, that if they can but get into the Seat, take it for granted, that all must own their right on pain of Damnation.

And what if in any such Land, the Prince change his mind, or the next differ,

differ  
them  
to ad  
L  
any  
truth  
dang  
Voice  
Conf  
nounc  
Learn  
wond  
perf  
of the  
Chur  
even  
XC  
to pr  
pists  
admi  
Ant.  
nuoul  
the C  
but t  
witho  
or se  
then  
them  
If t  
and d  
XC  
to b  
oursel  
Any  
Body  
dy, as  
fect,  
bad,  
as to b  
they n  
sind  
them  
sord



differ, and put down all these same men, and set up such as differ from them more than we do, is it damning Schism for any of their People still to adhere to them?

LXXXIX. Do you find that Mr. Dodwel, Dr. Saynel, Dr. Sherlock, or any of these men, do, in Pulpit and Press, ingenuously tell the People the truth of the Case, when they liken men as Schismatics to Murderers for danger? Did you ever hear them say, [*The Canon, which is the Churches Voice and Law, doth Excommunicate you all that do own your Opinions against Conformity, and commandeth us not to admit you to the Sacrament, and yet to pronounce your Excommunication for not taking it: We confess they have been holy and Learned Men that have thought many things imposed unlawful; and therefore we wonder not if it be not in your power to change your judgment, no more than to be perfect in knowledge; and we confess if you are unjustly Excommunicated, or any of the things made necessary to Communion be against Gods Word, then it is the Church that is guilty of Schism, but because this is not so, we accuse you of Schism, even of separating from the Universal Church, and from Salvation.*]

XC. I do admire, that never any one of them would be prevail'd with to prove the Canons Excommunications *ipso facto* lawful, when even Papists have scorn'd all such doings; and when the learnedst of all their own admired men, that were for compromising matters with Rome, even *Mar. Ant. de Dom. Spalatensis de Rep. Eccl.* hath so confidently, copiously and strenuously damn'd it: Christ would have none Excommunicate, whatever the Crime be, without Impenitency after due admonition for Repentance, but these Canons *ipso facto* Condemn and Excommunicate Godly men, without ever admonishing them, or calling them to repent, or hearing or seeing them: Nothing is necessary but the proof of the fact, and then the Law is instead of a Judge; and to oblige the People to avoid them, it must be published.

If this and all things named in the first *Plea for Peace*, be sinless, studying and disputing is not the way to know what is sinful.

XCI. But, saith the Resolver, [*Christ hath but one Body, and to be a Member of two separate and Opposite Churches, is to be contrary to ourselves.*]

*Ans.* But I had hoped your Catechized Boyes had known, 1. That one Body hath many parts. 2. That particular Churches are parts of this Body, as Corporations are of the Kingdom. 3. That all the parts are imperfect, and made up of none but sinners. 4. That every good man is partly bad, and so contrary to himself. 5. That Churches may be so far separate as to be distinct, and yet not so far as to be contrary or opposite. 6. That they may be opposite in *Accidents* and *Integrals*, that are one in *specie* in *Essentials*. 7. That a man may own several Churches, and Communicate with them for that which they agree in, and yet not own both, (or either perhaps)

haps) in that which they are *opposite* in. 8. That there being *some* but *opposite* in all men and Churches on Earth, you damn your selves for Communicating with them. 9. That a man may have more Communion with the Church which he *Locally separateth* from, even for sin, than with that which he is present with.

E. g. A Congregation or Nation of men of eminent Sanctity and Order, sound Doctrine and Worship, may, by humane frailty take some one falsehood or uncertain thing to be necessary to Ministry or Communion (as they say some Churches unhappily of late reject all that own not the Antiquity of the *Hebrew Points*) I cannot have local Communion with that Church, for they will not receive me, unless I subscribe either a falsehood, (or that which I judge false;) but yet I highly honour and love them, and have mental Catholick Communion with them, when perhaps necessity may make me Locally join with a Church of far worse men and Order, that will impose no sin on me. 10. And I would advise these men, did they not despise my advice, for the Church of *Englands* sake, and their own, to retract their Errors, and not lay such a Snare before the People. Should you say in the Pulpit, [ *If the Church be guilty of any Schism by her Impositions, ( oft-named ) Excommunications and silencing of Christs Ministers, and afflicting good people without just Cause, then I, and all that communicate with it and me, communicate in the guilt of Schism, and are all in as much danger of Damnation by it as Adulterers and Murderers* ] tell not your hearers this, for if you do, some will think you bid them *separate* or be *damm'd*; and only make a doubt whether most men have Noses or not.

XCH. *Qu. But is not the Inference true?*

*Ans.* No, it's false: There are twenty cases in which 1. One may be guilty of Schism and not be a Schismatick, as denominated from what predominateth: 2. And as many in which he is not at all guilty that communicateth with the guilty.

And let the world (that is sober and awake) judge now whether these men or we be the greater Schismatics, and which more condemneth or separateth from the Church of *England*. We say that all Churches have some degree of Schism, and so hath the Church of *England*, as it hath imperfection, Error and Sin; but that it is not therefore *no Church*, nor is it unlawful to communicate with it; All Christians and Churches must not be separated from that are guilty of some degree of Schism.

If any will turn these Serious matters into Jest, and say, as Dr. *Saywell*, that they will receive *Greeks, Lutherans, &c.* that come to their Communion, his Serious Readers will tell him, that so will most Sects receive those

those that approve of their Communion and come to them : joyning with you signifyeth that they are of your way therein ; But will you go to *their Churches and Communicate* with them? You will receive the damned Schismatics if they come to you, when yet you make it damnable to joyn in their meetings with them. This quibbling befeems not grave men in great matters.

To conclude, Reader, God having allowed more Legislative Power to men in things *Secular* than in Religion, I may say this case is like ours in debate.

I. Some Judges and Lawyers say, that the Oath of Allegiance makes a Subject in this Kingdom; that the *Renouncing* or Violating it by *Treason*, or *Rebellion*, or *deserting the Kingdom*, overthrows the Relation. But that other particular faults or quarrels against Neighbours, Justices, Judges, yea the King himself, are punishable according to the Laws, but are not all Rebellion, nor dissolve Subjection, nor oblige the Subjects to renounce civil converse with each other; though some contempt and obstinacy may outlaw them. Such is our Judgment of Church Relation and Communion, which I need not rehearse.

II. Suppose a sect of Lawyers and Judges arise, that say, no men are the Kings Subjects, but are Rebels, that break any of his Laws, that Shoot not in long Bows, that Bury not their dead in Woollen, that swear profanely, that eat flesh in *Lent* unlicensed, that have any unjust Law-Suit, that wrong any Neighbour, that oppress any Poor man, all these are Rebels; yea all that plead opposite Causes at the Bar, and all Judges that judge contrary to one another, and all that misunderstand any point of Law and Practice accordingly, and all that besides the Oath of Allegiance do constitute Marriages, Families, Schools, Societies by any other Covenants of their own, and all that are of different Cities and Companies, parts of the Kingdom, or all whose Justices, Mayors, Sheriffs, &c. differ from one another in any point of Law and practice: Or all that obey not every Constable and Justice; or that go to divers Justices in the same Precincts, or that go from one Justice to another to avoid unrighteous Judgment, or that go from the Physician of the Place for Health, and from the Schoolmaster of the Town for greater edification, or that Travel beyond Sea for Knowledge, yea all that understand not every word in the Law, that may concern them: If any say, none of these are the Kings Subjects, but Rebels, opposite to him and one another, and deserve to be all hang'd as Murderers, and so are all that have Communion with them; *Quare*, 1. Whether these men are for the Unity of England? 2. And are Friends to the King that deprive him of all his Subjects; as much as those that would have him have no Subjects, that be not of the same Age, Stature, Complexion and Wit. 3. And whether they are Friends to Mankind? 4. And whether they:

condemn not themselves if they live not as Anchorets, out of humane Society. 5. And whether that Nation be not by infatuation prepared for Destruction that would believe them, and would hate, scorn and ruine them that are of the first mentioned opinion, according to the saying, *Quos perdere vult Jupiter, hos dementat.*

As to the more dangerous Doctrine now threatening this Land, that would subject *England* to a Foreign Jurisdiction, on pretence of a Necessity of either an Universal Church Monarch, or Church-Parliament Senate or Council, or of all the Church on Earth represented by Patriarchs or Metropolitans, or that plead for *Subjection to them*, under the Name of Communion, they require a distinct Answer. But *Dr. If. Barrow*, and *Mr. Beverley's* Catholick Catechism, have effectually done it.

## FINIS.



THE  
SECOND PART  
AGAINST  
SCHISM:  
BEING  
ANIMADVERSIONS

On a Book famed to be Mr. *Raphson's*.

---



---

L O N D O N:

Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the Bible and Three Crowns in  
*Cheapside*, near *Mercers-Chappel*. 1684.

THE  
SECOND PART  
AGAINST  
SCHISM:

BEING  
ANIMADVERSIONS

On a Book printed by Mr. Hapgood's



LONDON:

Printed for the Author, at the Bible and Tract Society's Office, No. 1, Pall Mall East, 1844.

which  
I am  
my  
Church  
Imp  
done  
com  
on  
on  
and  
be  
much  
Ext

---

---

TO THE  
READER.

Reader,

**W**HEN I had Written the first of these Discourses, I came after to know more of the Authors Judgment, by another Book against me; which I also Answered, but it lyeth by unprinted. I also wrote, for the use of some private Friends, my Reasons for Communion with those Parish-Churches who have Capable Ministers, which many Importuned me to Print; but that also is yet undone: But a Book famed to be Mr. Raphsons coming out, I thought it my duty to Animadvert on that, and to bear my Testimony against Schism on both Extreame, lest I be guilty of Partiality, and of the Sin and suffering of many that may be deceived by them. If these Two be not over-much discouraged, the other Two against both the Extreame may come hereafter.

TO THE  
READER

W H A I had Written in full of  
the subject of the present  
work, by another Book against me;  
which I have answered, but it hath by un-  
happy means for the sake of some private friends,  
been taken for a Communion with those I  
condemn: who have Capable Ministers, which many  
impartuned me to Print; but that also is yet un-  
done: But a Book pointed to by Mr. Raphson  
in his Essay, I thought it my duty to disavow  
as that, and to bear my Testimony against Schism  
on both Extremes, lest I be guilty of Partiality  
and of the sin and suffering of many that may  
be deceived by them. If Book Two be not over-  
much discouraged, the other Two against both the  
Extremes may come hereafter.



---

THE  
SECOND PART  
AGAINST  
SCHISM, &c.

---

*The Reasons of Mr. Raphson, and such others,  
against going to the Parish-Churches, consi-  
dered.*

**T**HE Matter of his Book, as against Persecution, is very considerable; the Style is very close and pungent: His Doctrine against Communion with the Churches that use the Liturgy, is that which I examine.

The sum of it is, 1. That kneeling at the reception of the Sacrament, and the use of the Liturgy, are unlawful.

2. That they are false Worship, and Idolatry.
3. That the places where they are used, are Idol-Temples.
4. That to joyn there in them, is to partake in Idolatry.
5. The proof of all this is by this Argument; 'Worship not instituted, is not lawful; but kneeling in receipt of Bread and Wine, is Worship not instituted by Christ: therefore not lawful; therefore

'not pleasing, p. 160, 161. To which, by way of Motive, he  
 'addeth, p. 275. How many once in the separation, are returned  
 'back to the Vomit they once cast up, and wallow in the mire of  
 'a worldly worship? &c. Is compliance in Idol-Temples, going  
 'to *Dan* and *Bethel*, bowing to *Baal*, sitting, or drinking with the  
 'superstitious inacts of religious adoration, a witness for, or against  
 'defection? Are you turned as silly sheep ( that once were called  
 'shepherds ), to bleat after other shepherds, that Christ never sent,  
 'nor bid you go after them, &c. Looks it not like a declining of  
 'the Camp of Christ, the work of the Gospel, and setting your  
 'face towards *Babel*, &c.? Is scandal of no weight with you, &c.?   
 'How dare you venture your souls to sit under Means that he says  
 'shall not profit you ; and which is worse, lies under his curse? *Jer.*  
 '23. 32. *Mal.* 1. 14. with more such. Either this Writer knoweth  
 how ill he dealeth with his Reader, or not: If he do, it's a double  
 fault: if not ( which I think ), it's a doleful case, that every well-  
 meaning man, that can but be confident in his ignorance and error,  
 and father it on God, should become such a snare to them that  
 cannot see through his Pretences, and should himself suffer for  
 sinning, and call it the Cause of God, and condemn all that sin  
 not as confidently as he ; and hereby harden his afflictors, by shew-  
 ing them his weakness, and impenitently justifying his sin.

If he would not have ensnared his Reader, he should first have  
 opened the meaning of the words of his Question, that they might  
 know how much of the Dispute is *material*, and how much only  
 about words. 2. And then he should have so proved his assertion  
 and accusation, as might satisfy a good Conscience in a matter  
 wherein God, the Church, and Souls, are so much concerned ; and  
 not have poured out Accusations by way of Motives, upon unproved  
 and false suppositions.

I find but one Argument, which I shall now answer plainly :

His Major is, [ *Worship not instituted, is not lawful* ]. Ans. 1. The  
 word [ *Worship* ] in general, signifieth, 1. *Any thing done in honour to*  
*another* ; and so all our obedience to God is *Worship* : It is to his  
 glory that we must do all. I suppose that this he meaneth not.  
 2. *Any immediate act or expression of the honour and reverence of the heart.*  
 If this be not it that he meaneth by *Worship*, I know not what he  
 meaneth.

This

This *Worship*, as *within*, is the secret act of the soul ; as exprest, it is the act of the body.

Of such *Worship* there are two sorts : One sort is made necessary, statedly, by God's commanding it in particular. To this no man must add the like, or from it diminish any thing so commanded, either pretending God's authority, or his own. The other sort is but the subordinate *ordering* of the former, and is but the *manner* of doing it. This God doth not institute in particular, but only give man a general Rule, how to choose it himself ; which is, That all be done in love, and to edification, decently and in order.

Either this latter sort is to be called *Worship*, or not : If it be, then it falls under his opposition : If not, then, 1. He must give us a definition of *Worship*, which shall exclude it ; and so *Worship* must be somewhat else than the *direct* or *immediate acting* or *expressing honour to God* : And then who knows what he meaneth by it ? 2. And then when we plead for mens making none but this, he should to avoid deceit, confess that the Controversie is only of *the Name* ( whether Modes and Circumstances of God's instituted *Worship*, may be called *Worship* ), and not at all of the *Thing* ( whether it be lawful or not ) : This had been like a Christian Teacher.

Now I answer, 1. to his first Proposition : 1. *Worship* which is neither instituted particularly, nor in the general, appointing man how to choose it, is unlawful. 2. And to invent worship without God's allowance, contrary, or of the same kind, as if he had not done his part, is unlawful. 3. But for man to choose and use such worship as is but the right ordering of God's Institutions, is commanded by him, and a Duty ; and therefore not unlawful.

2. As to his *Minor*, or Second Proposition, I answer, Kneeling at the Sacrament, and communicating with Parish Churches that have tollerable Ministers, are not instituted of God in particular, but the Genus of them is instituted, and we commanded to choose our selves, according to God's general Rules, to the best of our understanding : and so they are our Duty, and not unlawful.

I give the Instances of these two sorts of worship :

*First,*

*First*, God hath Instituted, that our Minds Worship him, in believing, and receiving all his Gospel Revelations, and trusting them; and in desiring all things Petitioned in the Lords Prayer, and in consenting to all commanded in the Scriptures; and in Dedicating our selves to him cordially in Baptism, and renewing it in the Lords Supper, in commemoration of Christ's Death, till he comes. He hath Instituted the Corporal Expressions of all these; That we confess Christ in all the necessary Articles of Faith; That we ask the Petitions of the Lords Prayer; That we perform the Commands of the Decalogue towards God, and all others in the Scripture. These are the Instituted Worship which none must alter.

*Secondly*, The *Manner* and *Ordering*, which is the Second sort (which I leave every one to call *Worship*, or not, when they have defined Worship) which man may, and must chuse himself, without any Particular Institution of God, contain such Acts as these.

1. Undertermined gestures of Reverence and Honour in time of Publick Worship. As to be uncovered, or put off the Hat at Prayer, or the Lord's Supper. This we do directly in honour and reverence to God, whom we there Worship; and therefore it is it self a subordinate act of Worship.

So to stand, or kneel at Prayer, and not to sit. Though in Scripture we read of sitting, standing, kneeling, and prostration: yet no one of these is made necessary by Institution: yet are they subordinate Acts of Worship, expressing our inward Worship of God: And the reason why being uncovered, or kneeling, are now chosen, is not a particular Institution, but because the Custom of the Country hath made them the most congruous Expression of our inward Worship: when as *Paul* tells us, That then and there it was a shame for a man to be covered: and the whole Church for many hundred years forbade all kneeling, in Adoration, on the Lord's Days. And more,

To these I add, the gesture of the Adult in Baptism, whether they shall be Baptized kneeling, to signify Humble Reception, or not, is left to choice.

So is the Gesture in singing Psalms: If any think, that speaking to God by prayer, praise, or thanksgiving in Psalms, should in honour to God be done Standing, or Kneeling, rather than Sitting, it is no addition to God's Institution. And that we commonly use sitting in Psalmody, and not when we Pray in Prose, is merely because Custom maketh one more offensive than the other.

The



The same I say of the Gesture of Preaching, which some do sitting with their Hats on, and others stand to avoid a seeming dishonour of Gods Name and Service. Also, some holy Nonconformists I have known, that would rarely name God but with their Hats put off, or bowing their Heads; or with Hands and Eyes lift up towards Heaven. (Old Mr. *Atkins* at *Tipton* near *Dudley*, did thus use to shew such Reverence, when he named God, that would strike Reverence into those that saw and heard him: and hath oft Affected me more than a Sermon.) This was External Worship, not Instituted in the particulars, but in general of Reverence to God.

2. Another instance is in *Vows to God*, which are acts of Worship: But for the *Master* of them, several things may be Vowed which are not particularly commanded, but onely in the General. And for the *Form* or *Words*, I do not think that Mr. *Raphson* can shew me all that *Vow* called the *Covenant*, in any particular Institution; and yet I conjecture, that he taketh it not to be Idolatry, nor Unlawful.

3. Another Instance is, in things devoted and offered to God The Scripture in general saith, *Honour God with thy substance, and with the first Fruits of thy increase*. And that Christians at first sold all, and laid at the Apostles Feet; which yet *Peter* tells *Ananias* he might have chosen not to do. And for many hundred years after, they brought their Weekly Donations for the Ministers, Sacraments, and Poor, to the Altar, and Offer'd it first to God: And so *Paul* would have the *Corinthians* give their Collections as to God, for the Saints. But no Institution told them how much they should give, but the General Rule.

4. Another Instance is, the length or degree of outward Worship: If I pray two hours rather than one, it is an act of Honour, or Worship, not particularly commanded.

So whether men shall in Publick read one Chapter, or two; sing one Psalm or two, or more, is undetermined by God.

5. Another is about set Days and Hours for Worship; as to keep a yearly Thanksgiving for Deliverance from the Powder Plot; the Spanish Invasion; for the Reformation, &c. So also Fasts, and what days Lectures shall be kept, and what hour: And what day and hour the Lord's Supper shall be Administred; which are Circumstantial Acts of Worship.

6. Another Instance is in the choice of Psalms and Hymns: the use of *Dauids* are Lawful, and so are others; but no Institution

tyeth us to *One*, but leaveth us to chuse.

7. Another Instance is in the *Tunes* and Metre of Psalms, which we use as Subordinate Acts of Worship. It is but lately that the Churches used Metre and Melody of Tune; but *Prose* read with a loud Voice: yet I hope we are not Idolaters for our Metre and Melody: which I may say also of Church Musick, which *David* used, and we may do, where it's Edifying; but it's no Institution now. Yea, when *Paul* directs the Church to use Psalms, *Hymns*, and *Spiritual Songs*; which is for *singing with grace in our hearts to the Lord*, and therefore it is Worship, which some men must indite and make.

8. Another Instance is, in the versions of the Psalms of *David*; where among many we may chuse which seems best.

9. Another Instance is, in the publick and private Reading of the Scriptures Translated: where every word is the work of man: God wrote it not in *English*, but in *Hebrew* and *Greek*; but man Translates it, some well, and some defectively; yet I hope, an *English* Bible is not an Idol.

10. So also the dividing the Scriptures into Chapters, and Verses, which are the Works of man, is no Idolatry.

11. And another Instance is, the Method and Words of Sermons and Prayers: whether a Minister shall Preach by way of Doctrine, Reason, and Use; or otherwise: and Expound by way of Paraphrase, or otherwise; what words he shall use, God hath not Instituted in particular; but mens invention maketh these, some suddenly, and some beforehand.

12. Another Instance is, the use of helps, or written Words; Whether one shall use Notes in Preaching, and read them, or not? Whether the words of a Prayer shall be written, and read, or not; God hath not determined. And so Books of Catechism, Publick Confessions, Prayers, Meditations as formed, are all the works of man, and no Idolatry. And if Parents impose words of Prayer on their Children, it is no Sin; as *Deut. 6.* and *11.* shew.

13. Another Instance is in the form of Ordination, when the Words and many Circumstances are undertermined. Imposition of Hands is a lawful Sign: and so is doing it by a Writing, or by meer Words, without that Imposition; some receive it Kneeling, some Standing; some by one Form of Words, some by another, &c. some from one Ordainer, some from many, &c. And none of these determined by Institution.

14. The same is true of Discipline; The Form of Words for Admonition, for Absolution, for Excommunication, for the Penitents Confession and Request, are left to Humane Wisdom, so the matter and manner be regulated by the general Law. And they that say, that God hath Instituted, that the Church shall be Governed Necessarily by fixed Classes, with Appeals to National Synods, and that here a *Major* Vote hath Governing Power over the lesser part; yea, and that these must be made up of Two sorts of Elders, of which one sort, are un-ordained, or are not Authorised to Administer the Word and Sacraments, do but add to the Word of God, if they say these National Assemblies are the Supreme Church-Power; what Law of God did ever Institute, That a Minister, or Classis, *e. g.* in *Geneva, Brema, Scotland*, is not as much subject to the Decrees of a larger Council of many Nations; and that the Synod at *Dort* had not as much Power as a lesser at *Hague*: or a Synod of many Nations as much as one in *Scotland*? But if (as by parity of Reason they must) they say, that General or large Councils are the Governours of National Assemblies, as they are of Classis and Presbyteries: then they bring us under a Foreign Jurisdiction, which the Kingdom is sworn against; and I think they are *Papists*, but of the *French* sort, who make General Councils Superior Governours of the Universal Church.

And if they determine the bounds of Church-Power, by the Magistrates Laws, and yet damn *Erastians*, they seem in ignorance to deal too hardly with themselves.

15. Another Instance is, in the Place of Publick Worship: God hath not determined where the Assembly shall meet: where the Pulpit, Font, Table, &c. shall stand. And if great and lofty Structures, called Temples, be Built, purely to shew how we honour God, and Religion: as *Constantine*, and others after him, did at *Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem*, over the Grave of Christ, and all over the Empire: this Actual Expression of Honour to God, is *Cultus modalis & secundarius*, a subservient sort of Worship, and no Idolatry, but Lawful.

16. The same I say of Church Utensils: If for the Honour of God and Religion, the Pulpits, and Tables have Ornaments of Silk, Cups, and Trenchers, and Flaggons of Silver; the Font and Seats have some special Neatness, &c. this is left to Man's Determination, without any particular Institution, and is no Idolatry.

17. And if as Judges and Lawyers have distinguishing Habits, the

Ministers have *ſo*, ( officiating, and at other times ) to no worſe end ( or manner ) than the ſaid Utenſils are put ; I know no Inſtitution that is croſt by it, nor that forbids it.

18. Another Inſtance may be of Speaking in the Aſſembly, whether it ſhall be One Miniſter, or Two, or Three. Whether Laymen may not be Interlocutors by Questions, yea, and ſometime Preach and Pray, &c. God hath not particularly determined, but left to Human Choice.

19. Many good Chriſtians knowing the Lord's Day to be an Inſtituted Day of Thankſgiving for the greateſt Mercies, do as an Act of Honour wear their beſt Cloathes, and Feaſt themſelves and the Poor accordingly that day : This is Lawful, by the General Law ; but not particularly Inſtituted by God.

20. Profeſſing Signs in our Covenantings with God, and Confeſſing of our Religion, are left to be choſen onely by the General Laws of Edification, and Order. When a Nation, or Church, or Perſon renew their Covenant with God, and their Confeſſion of Faith, it may be done ( when the Ruler demandeth their conſent ) either by word, or by ſubſcribing, or by *lifting up the hand*, or by *ſtanding up*, or by *bowing the Head*; for theſe are all, or moſt found in Scripture inſtances ; yea, ſometimes they fell by *Proſtration to the Ground* : yea, and ſo they oft did in receiving a Charge or Meſſage from God, by his Miniſters.

I will add no more Inſtances ; Theſe are enough. If yet it be ſaid, That none of theſe be *acts of Worſhip* : I again Answer, 1. Then do not by Slander call them ſo, and ſay ſtill, that Man's inventing or uſing theſe, is uſing *false Worſhip*. If they be *no Worſhip*, they are *no false Worſhip*. Confeſs then, that it's but a *bare name* that you charged with Idolatry : for its onely ſuch things as theſe that we would add. 2. But *de nomine*, If an Action done directly to honour God be to be called *Worſhip* ; ſome of theſe at leaſt may be called *Secondary ſubordinate Worſhip* : But if you appropriate the Name to Gods *ſtated Ordinances*, theſe muſt not be called *Worſhip* ; but the *manner, order, circumſtances, or accidents* of Worſhip. But call them what you will, they are but what God alloweth, and the General of them he commandeth.

I need not ſay much to his Applicatory Words. 1. To return from Separation, to Love and Union, is as ſicly called, a *Returning to their Vomit*, as returning from Drunkenneſs and Fornication, to Sobriety and Chaſtity may be ſo called. Repentance is caſting up our Sin.

2. The



2. The Names of *bowing to Baal, Dan and Bethel, Babylon, Idols, &c.* are as easily used by Quakers, Ranters, Familists, &c. against all God's Church and Worship: And they were worn so thread-bare by the railing Separatists (then called *Brownists*), against the Old Learned Godly Nonconformists, that they turned to the Speakers reproach. And I suppose he knoweth that the *Scots* were called as bad, and worse, by the Army that conquered them in 1650, &c.

3. That *sitting or drinking with the superstitious in acts of religious adoration, is a sign of defection.* This would make all Backsliders who so *sit and drink with him*, and such as he, who is so superstitious, as to turn sin into duty, and duty into sin, and falsely father Laws on God: Yea, that is worse than superstitious, as is after manifested. 2. Superstition is an offering somewhat as pleasing to God, which is not pleasing to him. All Christians have some degree of this in *Matter or Manner*; for we know but in part, and prophesie in part, &c. And so no Christians must joyn with others. But must they not give over all Religious Duty themselves, seeing their own defects more defile them than other mens?

3. Christ doth not disown all imperfect worship that hath some Superstition: And we must receive one another as Christ receiveth us. 4. It was Superstitious persons that *Paul* commandeth Christians to receive to Communion, *Rom. 14.* 5. Thus he condemneth the Apostles, and the Churches then, and the Scripture it self. 6. It is dreadful revolting to choose rather forbearance of all Church Communion, than to Communicate with our Parish Churches, when better cannot be had, and men are not forced to any sin themselves. And he that will communicate with none that sin in Preaching, Prayer, Sacraments, shall communicate with none. 7. It is a gross Service of Satan and Popery, to fight against Love and Unity, and bring all the Publick Assemblies under disgrace, as unlawful, that Popery may take possession unreisted.

4. His words of [*silly Sheep bleating after any Shepherd, &c.*] are but a Net to catch silly Souls. It's the common Trap of the Papists, to put ignorant people to prove the Calling of the Ministers, or forsake them. They that preach the Gospel, and do the Office (tho faultily), and are in possession, have a Calling sufficient to justifie the Hearers, when it may not be enough to justifie

Justifie themselves: A better Call than the High Priests that Christ did send men to.

5. As to the Argument of Scandal; It is of dreadful weight to deter a tender Conscience (as from conforming to sin, so) from his groundless Separation, and war against Unity and Love.

6. That God saith *such Means shall not profit; yea, curse it*, is a slander against God and Scripture, and all the Church on Earth that's known; by perverting and misapplying the Text.

I shall now better prove the lawfulness of using such things as these, than he hath proved it unlawful.

1. That which no Law of God, or valid Law of Man, forbids, is not unlawful: but the use of the things forementioned, no Law of God, or valid Law of Man forbids: Therefore the use of the things forementioned, is not unlawful.

He that will say that there is any such Law, must shew that Law, and prove his Affirmative: But let him take heed of adding to God's Law: A false Prophet that fathered a false Message from God, was an heinous sinner. Is it not worse falsely to father a Law on him?

Perhaps they will say, that *God forbids adding or diminishing*: I answer, He doth so: Therefore let them take heed of it, who say his Law forbids that which it never forbid, but in general commandeth. If we must not add to the Laws of the Land, yet the Bookbinder that covereth them, and the Lawyers and Judges that expound them, do not add thereby to the Law. When the Hearers bowed, and prostrated themselves in reverence to God, they did not by this add to the Law; nor yet when they made a Vow uncommanded, or a Free-Will-Offering: And I think it was no sinful addition to the Law, for the Publican to smite his Breast, and look downward; and when *Jeremy* said, *No man smiteth on his thigh, and saith, what evil have I done?* The meaning is not, No man idolatrously giveth God false worship. And I think, that they that rent their clothes to express their repentance, did not add to God's Word, nor yet do it as necessary worship, tho *Joel* says, *Rent your hearts, and not your garments.*

Some

Some Object, That *Christ's sitting at the Sacramental Supper*, is a Law to us, forbidding any other gesture. But this Author professeth, that all the actions of Christ, or his Apostles, are not Laws binding us to do the like: If they be, we break many such Laws; as when we do not eat a full Meal before the Sacrament, when we do it not without women, only to a Family, or to Twelve, only to Teachers, in an upper Room, in an Inn, or Private House, and that we do not lie along, leaning, as they did; especially when we take it not at Supper-time, and turn the Lord's Supper to a Breakfast or Dinner. The Apostles brake no Law when they differed from any of these, which were but occasional Circumstances.

It's said by some, That Christ's Example binds us to a Table-gesture: But 1. That may be *convenient*, and yet *not necessary*: The bare Example binds us not to it. 2. If it did, that were but like the general Law; *Let all be done to edification, and in order*; and binds to no one sort of gesture at all: For then when they eat standing, it would bind us to stand; and if they eat kneeling (as Labourers oft do at Harvest-work in the Fields), it would bind us to kneel; if they eat lying, as the *Jews* did, it would bind us to that: and so this would but tie us to the Custom of the Countrey. But in feasting with God, we may sometimes do it more lowly than in a common Table-gesture, and break no Law. When *Mary* was, it's like, on her knees, washing Christ's feet with her Tears, if he had offered her Bread or Wine, it's like it had been no Idolatry so to take it.

But the grand Objection is, that *we worship Bread and Wine*; which can be no better than a slander, when the very Liturgy and Doctrine of the Church, not only renounce Transubstantiation, but the very real *Presence* of Christ's Body, which yet many thousand Protestants believe.

Object. But you kneel before the Bread and Wine, and make it a *mediate* Object of adoration, contrary to the Second Commandment.

Ans. 1. We neither make any Image, nor invent this *Medium*, nor yet symbolize with Idolaters, while we renounce the very Object (Transubstantiate Bread) which they adore; and therefore break not the Second Commandment, no more than

than we do in kneeling in lawful Prayer, because they kneel in praying before Images, or to Angels.

2. An Object of worship is either a meer *motive exciting Object*, or else a *terminative mediate worshipped Object*. The first is more than lawful: For we should be moved and stirred up by the works of God, even by our Meat and Drink, by Sun and Moon, and all that we see, to worship God: And this is properly but the Object of our *thoughts*, and the *motive* of our outward acts: And the Sacrament is no more. But if we did direct our worship *terminatively* to the *Bread and Wine*, as a *mediate Object*, by which it should pass to God, this were to break the Second Commandment, like Image-worship.

There are many Instances in Scripture, of people that have bowed to God before the Prophet, moved by his word and presence, who yet break not the Second Commandment, nor idolized the *Words* or *Prophets*: So *Joshua* fell down to the Angel, *Josh. 4*. We give thanks for the Meat that stands before us on the Table, as a *Motive-Object*; and we may do it on our knees: Is this an idolatrous worshipping of our Meat? I have many a time seen a miserable Beggar, when one hath given him Money or Meat, fall down on his knees, and take it, saying, *I thank God and you*; Did this make the giver his Idol? How sad is the case of ignorant young Christians, whose Consciences must be racked or cheated by such Sophistry, because their wits be not ripe enough to find out the deceit?

II. Another Argument: *That is not unlawful which God commandeth us in general to choose and do, and so alloweth in the Particulars: But such are the Twenty Things before mentioned, &c.*

God commandeth us to do all things in Love, and Concord, and Order, to edification. This must needs reach to the undetermined circumstances. We cannot worship God publickly at all, but it must be in some words, in some gestures, in some time, in some place; nor profess our Faith, and Covenant-consent, but by some sign: and so of the rest. If you choose no one, when God hath tied us to none, but bid us choose to edification, we break his General Law. If you can prove that we choose amiss, the Fault will be, not that we choose, but that we choose not better.

II. That



III. That is not unlawful which Christ and his Apostles did before us without blame, and belongeth also unto us. But such is the use of such Modes and Circumstances of God's instituted worship, which are left variable, and free to occasional choice, &c.

What Christ did, I shall speak more anon. *Paul* hath his [ *Not the Lord, but I* ]; signifying, that the thing was not determined by a Law, *Rom. 14.* He judgeth circumstantial differences such as should not break communion, when yet they that kept days, or kept them not; and they that did eat, or not eat, did it as to the Lord. And did he bid them not judg each other for idolatry? or say, *Rom. 14. 17, 18.* That Idolaters were acceptable to God, or approved of men? or *Rom. 15.* or bid them receive Idolaters, as Christ received us? He regulateth their Church-Meetings, *How many* shall speak at a Meeting, and by what course and order; and that women shall be veiled, and not men; and that they salute each other with an holy Kiss, &c. not by a Law that fettereth the Particulars, but by the General Law of doing all in order, and to edification; and pleadeth not Institution, but the Custom of the Churches, which is alterable, as the signification of such acts are. And *St. James* will have the Elders anoint the sick with Oyl for recovery, which yet bindeth not us. The Papists use this as an Institution, as they do imposition of hands in Confirmation: They say in Ordination, Receive the Holy Ghost, and breathe on the Person: They wash the feet of one another in imitation of Christ: And yet these men condemn them in this, as superstitious, for imitating Christ and his Apostles, and Scripture-Examples, and cry down Popery, and at the same time call us Idolaters, for going beyond Scripture-institution. The same I say of their keeping Lent, in imitation of Christ's forty days fast, &c. Is it Idolatry both to follow, and not to follow Scripture-Examples?

To all the rest I add one Instance more: Swearing by appeal to God, is a most solemn act of worship: but the sign of taking an Oath, is left free to convenient choice. *Abraham's* Servant did it by putting his hand under his thigh: Was this a common Law, or Institution? Others did it otherwise: We do it by laying our hand on the Book, and kissing it. These are neither sinful additions, or Idolatry. The Memorial of God's Works, and Mens Covenants, were kept, sometime by pitching Stones, sometime by Pillars, sometime by set days (as the Feast of *Purim*), sometime by laying up the

Ensigns (as *Goliath's Sword*, &c.) And all these lawful, and no Idolatry.

IV. Lastly, I will unveil these mens Doctrine of Separation, and then judge whether it be the Doctrine of Christ, which is a Law of Love, and Union, and Peace; or the Wisdom from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, &c.

1. It is false, that all such Secondary Modal Worship, is unlawful, which is not instituted by a fixing Law.

2. It is deceit not to distinguish these different things.

3. The charge of [*false Worship*] unexplained, is meer deceit:

1. Worship is so far [*false*], as it is contrary to the Rule. Every Sermon, Prayer or Sacrament which we administer, hath faultiness and sin, and is so far [*false Worship*]. 2. But Worship offered God on pretence that he instituted it when he did not, or that Man hath authority to command the like, is yet worse *false Worship*.

3. And the worship of *false Gods* or *Idols*, is yet worse than that, and abhorred of God.

4. His making all *faulty circumstances*, such as he nameth, to be *Idolatry*, because *false*, as he calls it, is yet more sinful, and of mischievous importance.

5. So is it to make the Churches *Idols* Temples, where they do kneel at the Sacrament, and use the Liturgy.

6. So is it to feign falsely, that God calleth men to come out from such, and be separate, because he calleth them out of *Babylon*; falsely adding to the Laws of God.

7. By his Doctrine he maketh Christ an Idolater (which I mention with horror): For he 1. used Circumstances not instituted before, or by himself: He preached on a Mountain, in a Ship, &c. not commanded: He commended *Mary* for anointing him, washing his Feet with Tears, wiping them with her Hair, not instituted in particular: He commended the *Publican* for smiting on his breast, standing far off, not looking to Heaven, without particular command: His Custom was to go to the Synagogue worship: He from his childhood performed Temple-Duties and Service: He commanded the Lepers cleansed to go to the Priests, and offer their due, and his Disciples to hear the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* in *Moses* Chair, &c. And yet 1. The High Priests were not of *Aaron's* line, according to Institution. 2. They bought the Office of *Heavenly Romans*. 3. They had it not for life, according to institution. 4. Do-

ctrine,

*Erine, Worship, Discipline and Manners*, were heinously corrupted, so that the Hearers were to beware of the Leaven of their Doctrine, and not to imitate their lives. 4. They were bitter enemies of Christ, and Persecutors: yet Christ never bid his Disciples to separate from any thing but their errors; but saith, *They shall cast you out of the synagogues*. And doubtless Christ committed no sin; nor can we be so holy as he.

8. He condemneth *Abraham*, and all the *Jewish Church* of old, that used such things that were not instituted in Worship, as is before mentioned in swearing, &c.

9. He maketh the Apostles Idolatrous that used the like.

10. He maketh the Primitive Churches Idolatrous, and the Scriptures to approve it. For they used such uninstituted things: yea, the *Romans* were guilty of differences in God's Service, and despising and judging each other for them; The *Corinthians* were Carnal in making Parties and Divisions, they defrauded each other, and went to Law before *Heathens*. They had Fornicators, Judaizing envious Slanderers of *Paul*, Heretical deniers of the Resurrection; such as eat in Idols Temples, or of their Sacrifices: Were drunk at, or before the Sacrament. The *Galatians* are yet sharper charged: Almost all the Seven Churches *Rom. 2. and 3.* had *Nicholaitans*, or *Jezabels* Doctrine, which God hated: and no Christian is called to separate from the Communion of any one of all these; but commanded to amend, and live in Unity, without division.

11. He condemneth as Idolaters all the Churches on Earth, for Six Hundred, if not One Thousand Years after the Apostles; not One Church Christian, or Heretick (as far as any History tells us that I have found) did ever deny such things, as he calls False Worship, or Idolatry. They all ~~went further~~ than our Parish Churches do. At Baptism they used the White Garment, tasting Milk and Honey, Chrisme or anointing the Forehead, Crossing; they adored onely Standing, and not Kneeling, every Lords Day, all as significant Ceremonies: No one Church or Person is said to scruple these; I think they did not well: but God rejected not their Worship.

12. He maketh all, or near all the Churches on Earth, Idolaters, at this day: All on Earth, save the *Protestants*, are far grosser in their Liturgies and Ceremonies than the *English*: Of the *Protestants*, *Sweden, Denmark, Saxony*, and all the *Lutherans*, have Liturgies, Crossing, Ceremonies, Church-Images, Consubstantiation. The

*Helvetians* are such as are called *Erastians*, making the Magistrate the onely Ruler, and Sacraments common. *Geneva*, and *France*, yea, and *Holland*, have their Liturgies, and some Rites.

13. He condemneth *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, *Anabaptists*, and all Dissenters that are here called *Protestants*. For they have all many of the foresaid uninstituted things: They put off the Hat in Church at Prayer. They stand up at the Blessing; they use uncommanded gestures at Sacrament; they use Psalm-versions, Metres, Tunes, Scripture-Translations, Divisions into Chapter and Verse, never instituted particularly. The *Scots* used a Government by Classes, National Assemblies of various Elders, ruling by Vote, instead of meer consulting for Concord, uncommanded.

14. I humbly propose it to consideration, Whether by consequence (which he seeth not, nor owneth) he do not deny Christ, and all the Gospel, and work of mans redemption: I challenge him to name me one Church on Earth for many hundred years after the Apostles, that had not that which he calls false Worship and Idolatry: Suppose this were but in a few Ages, as the second, third, or fourth Century: Then a Temple of Idols, and Company of Idolaters, is no true Church: And if at any time there was no Church there was no Head of the Church: No Kingdom, no King: No Wife, no Husband, that is no *Christ*. How much more, if he make all, or near all the Church Idolaters to this day, and himself with the rest?

15. If it be a heinous sin to bear false Witness against a Neighbour, or to slander one man, what is it to slander and back-bite all the Church on Earth, and Christ himself?

16. Is it not a work of Satan to destroy Love, and to render almost all Christians odious? And doth not he do so, that calleth them Idolaters? Is not this Preaching men into the hatred of each other? Do we owe no Love to any Christians, but such as is due to Idolaters? Is not the fruit of the Spirit otherwise described?

17. Doth he not deny that Communion of the Saints, which is an Article of the Creed? and tempt weak Christians into sinful Separations, Divisions, Slanders, Judgings, Murmurings, Envy, which are the fruits of the flesh?

18. Doth not this directly destroy the Church by Dissolution? When there is none to be owned or joyned with, that hath not somewhat which he calleth false worship. And is not separating the Materials, destroying the house?

19. Doth



19. Doth he not directly rush into the Sin which he condemneth adding to God's Laws, and saying he forbids what he forbids not? yea, fathering on him Laws more rigorous than the Jewish, as disowning Christ's Church as Idolaters and false Worshipers?

20. I add, such wofully harden men in that which they themselves suffer by, and which they call enmity and persecution, and make more Conformists while they deny it, than R. B. whom he frivouly talketh of, ever did (except it be a Conformity to Truth and Goodness.) For when men read and hear others confidently rage against Truth and Duty, by rash presumptuous ignorance, they judge of all our dissent by this: And while many run into this Guilt, it seems to justify their Afflictors: And it tempteth weak Persons to suffer for sinful separation as evil doers, thinking it is for Truth. Oh with what grief will understanding men see Christians together, as in a state of enmity by mistakes. To see some at once require from others, things good and necessary, things Lawful but unnecessary; things necessary in their *Genus*, but not this more than that, and some things sinful, as if they were all almost alike. To see those whose Senses are not exercised to discern things that differ, misled by the words and reverence of men, to swallow some Sins as excellent Duties, and fly from things Lawful; yea, oft from great Duties, as odious Sins, and suffer rejoicingly for sinning against God, and condemning all that sin not as they do; yea, even all, or almost all the Churches on Earth; yea, and calling them Idolaters for being wiser and better than they, who alas, do in all things shew themselves to be ignorant Babes, and who speak evil of that which they understand not. And then to see others revile, and hate, and ruin these mistaking Christians by a far more dangerous mistake; as if Religious fear of Sin, were an unsufferable thing, and such were intollerable Hypocrites, and Conscience were a disgraceful thing; and as if themselves and all Mankind were not liable to worse Errors, than to take some lawful things for Sin, when they see unlawful things stand near them, or among them.

But of all this, I have oft spoken, and now only say again, That if those justly called Separatists, and who think Parish Communion under honest Ministers to be Idolatry, or unlawful, will but without prejudice, read what is written to prove it lawful by the old Godly, Judicious Non-Conformists, especially *John Ball's* Trial of Separation, *Mr. Hildersham*, *Mr. Bradshaw*, *Dr. Ames*, *Mr. Cartwright*, *Mr. Gifford*, *Mr. John Pager*, *Mr. Brightman*, *Mr. Rathband*, &c. they will need:

need no more to save them from this scandalous Schism : But if *Pe-  
ter* withdraw or separate from the Gentiles for fear of offending the  
Jewish Christians, and *Barnabas* be led away with the Dissimulation,  
*Paul* must oppose it to their Faces: And I that have seen what the  
Spirit of Division hath done, and read that God never blest unneces-  
sary separation, will imitate *Paul*. And if this World be uncura-  
ble, the Lord prepare me for that World where Love and Unity  
have no Enemies.

---

FINIS.

---

